The Journal of Historical Review

William B. Lindsey
Zyklon B, Auschwitz, and the Trial of Dr. Bruno Tesch

H. Keith Thompson
Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz: Last President of a United Germany

James B. Whisker
Gnostic Origins of Alfred Rosenberg's Thought

L.A. Rollins
Yehuda Bauer and the 'Polemical and Apologetic Bias' of Jewish Historiography

—Book Reviews—
—News and Comment—

Volume Four, Number Three *Fall 1983*

The Journal of Historical Review

VOLUME FOUR, NUMBER THREE / FALL 1983

Zyklon B, Auschwitz, and the Trial of Dr. Bruno Tesch by William B. Lindsey

Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz: Last President of a United Germany by H. Keith Thompson

Gnostic Origins of Alfred Rosenberg's Thought by James B. Whisker

BOOK REVIEWS: L.A. Rollins on *A History of the Holocaust* • Mark Weber on *Das Hossbach-'Protokoll': Die Zerstoerung Einer Legende* • Charles Lutton on *Paris in the Third Reich: A History of the German Occupation, 1940-1944*

The Journal of Historical Review
is published quarterly by the
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

Thomas J. Marcellus, *Director*

Keith Stimely, *Editor*

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WALTER B. ALLENDE, Ph.D.
University of Buenos Aires
Buenos Aires, Argentina

AUSTIN J. APP, Ph.D.
La Salle College (Ret.)
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

GEORGE ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Los Angeles Unified School District
History Instructor

JOHN BENNETT
Victoria Council for Civil Liberties
Melbourne, Australia

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

ROBERT FAURISSON, Ph.D.
University of Lyon-2
Lyon, France

DITLIEB FELDERER
Revisionist History Magazine
Taby, Sweden

PERCY L. GREAVES, Jr.
Free Market Books
Dobbs Ferry, New York

SAMUEL E. KONKIN III
The New Libertarian
Long Beach, California

MARTIN A. LARSON, Ph.D.
The Spotlight
Washington, D.C.

WILLIAM B. LINDSEY, Ph.D.
Research Chemist

JAMES J. MARTIN, Ph.D.
Ralph Myles Publishers
Colorado Springs, Colorado

REVILO P. OLIVER, Ph.D.
University of Illinois (Ret.)
Urbana, Illinois

WILHELM STAEGLICH, Dr. Jur. (Ret.)
Badenweiler, West Germany

UDO WALENDY, Diplo. Pol.
Verlag fuer Volkstum und
Zeitgeschichtsforschung
Vlotho/Weser, West Germany

CHARLES E. WEBER, Ph.D.
University of Tulsa (Ret.)
Tulsa, Oklahoma

ANDREAS R. WESSERLE, Ph.D.
Marquette University (Ret.)
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

The Journal of Historical Review is published quarterly by the Institute for Historical Review, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscription prices are as follows: One year, $30; two years, $50; three years, $70—or the equivalent in foreign currency. Foreign subscribers must add $5 if paying by remittance drawn on a foreign bank. For domestic first class delivery add $5 per year. For overseas air delivery add $12 per year. Quantity subscription and bulk issue rates available on request. Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the editor, but must be accompanied by return postage.

Listed:

Library of Congress
British Library
Encyclopedia of Associations
Writers Market 1983
PTLA Catalog
EBSCO Librarians Handbook

ISSN: 0195-6752

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, U.S.A.

Permission is hereby granted for reprints of any article contained herein, providing that no changes or alterations are made prior to printing, and also providing that the following attribution appears with the article:

Reprinted by permission of *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscription rate: $30 per year.

Two copies of each printing should be submitted to the Editor of *The Journal of Historical Review*.

Contents

Zyklon B, Auschwitz, and the Trial of Dr. Bruno Tesch 261
William B. Lindsey

Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz: Last President of a United Germany 305
H. Keith Thompson

Gnostic Origins of Alfred Rosenberg's Thought 335
James B. Whisker

Review Article
Yehuda Bauer and the 'Polemical and Apologetic Bias' of Jewish Historiography 357
L.A. Rollins

Book Reviews 372

News and Comment 378

About the Contributors 384

A Note From The Editor

One of the first, most predictable reactions to be counted on by revisionist historians of World War II and of National Socialist Germany as they regale the uniniated with their views is: "But what about the *trials*—Nuremberg, and the others? Have they not left a record of ample proof of German crime and barbarity—thus vindicating the Allied struggle as a moral one that had to be waged?"

The trials of the Germans have indeed left quite a record. And though real historians and historical thinkers (there remained a few even after the intellectual straightjacket descended on the West for the duration) have always expressed the most extreme skepticism at, even contempt for, the idea that the true history of an epoch can be established by the evidence generated in politically motivated, rigged and farcical show-trials of the conquered by those who had beaten them down and had to keep them down, nevertheless it would be wrong to dismiss the historical value of such trials out of hand. Above all these trials did indeed generate *evidence*—of whatever kind and quality. And the historian *is* interested in *any* evidence. For him nothing is out of bounds. Unlike the judge or jury in a legal proceeding, he cannot be foresworn or constrained to totally dismiss or ignore any point of evidence because it was not obtained by-the-book-properly, because the source is tainted or compromised, or even because it might have been manufactured out of whole cloth. The rules of evidence in matters of justice do vary—sometimes they reflect a traditional and independent legality which stands with scrupulously blind eye, sometimes they reflect nothing but politics and dominance in blatant disregard of any real legality. (In a political trial the judgers may even operate on the effectual premise that to be ignored is any evidence *not* tainted, coerced, or invented.) In any case rules of evidence for courts are different from rules of evidence for historians. A court wishes to determine guilt or innocence; a historian may or may not care about this, but if he does he is not so limited as a court—any court—in considering what evidences and factors are relevant. And he may be looking for a "whole truth" beyond the bounds of an indictment. Ultimately, he should want to know "what happened," not just "who is guilty." In answering the one it is sometimes possible to answer the other; not always. There are causes for everything, but there is not always "guilt." The historian looks beyond the lawyer and judge—and sometimes he looks *at* them. It can be a searching look, especially when the *any and all* that he must get his hands on in order to find out "what happened" includes unsubstantiated, coerced, doctored, or otherwise specious evidence from the records of political trials. This evidence will indeed be considered, but perhaps in a different light than that which its generators intended. Yes, even the kind of trial justice that hops and punches can be useful to the historian; reaching into its pouch he might withdraw many interesting things. He might do what no lawyer can do: judge the judges. Time and *the record* allow this to happen.

Unfortunate and despicable as were the trials of the Germans from the standpoints of traditional Western justice and humanity, their records *and their verdicts* nonetheless do help us to determine the history of an epoch. But this is true in spite of, not because of, the bold and foolish announcements by their conveners that a large part of the purpose of the trials was to establish a *historical*, not just legal, verdict—and one meant to stand for all time. By looking carefully at the verdicts of these trials and at the evidence used to secure them, we gain at the very least an idea of the temper and methods of the times. Far more important, we can also draw a critical eye on the very issues the trials were meant to "settle." Have they been settled? In our lead article this issue we look at one case.

William B. Lindsey's examination of the trial of Dr. Bruno Tesch is a milestone in revisionism as it relates to war crimes trials. Whereas cases in the famous IMT and NMT trials at Nuremberg have received abundant attention, the lesser-known series of British Military Tribunals which were convened with summary haste right after the war have not been so well plumbed. Because in many cases these were trials of technical specialists, not political or military figures, historians might have hesitated to delve into areas that would require technical competence in their details. Especially so revisionist historians, who have always believed in getting down to *detail*. It is no surprise, then, that the first critical study of the great Zyklon B trial—"evidence" from which has been and is one of the prime props of the devolved "Holocaust" legend—

continued on p. 384

Zyklon B, Auschwitz, and the Trial of Dr. Bruno Tesch

WILLIAM B. LINDSEY

We still have judgement here, that we but teach Bloody instructions, which being taught return To plague th'inventor. This even handed justice Commends th'ingredience of our poison'd chalice To our own lips.

—Shakespeare, *Macbeth*

The Prelude to "Justice"

Toward the end of World War II, the designated legal representatives of the United Nations,[1] meeting in London with Lord Wright, Chairman of the United Nations War Crimes Commission, established the London Agreements to implement earlier agreements by the United Nations at Yalta and other war conferences, and to finally concretize numerous threats and warnings made by the United Nations to the Axis nations during the course of the war. Their intention was to impeach, prosecute and punish the vanquished Germans and Japanese for crimes newly defined and delineated by the victors themselves, and to do this with tribunals created by them for that single purpose.

The most atrocious crime of which the Germans were accused by the victors was that they had planned to kill all of the Jews of Europe; of the six million they allegedly succeeded in killing, four million were allegedly killed in gas chambers constructed for that purpose at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

To place these United Nations tribunals in their proper perspective, it is necessary to appreciate the attitude and temper of the United Nations allies toward Germany before and during these trials. Beginning at least as early as 1940, Germany's enemies—who later, on 2 January 1942, were to take the collective name of the "United Nations"—subjected their citizenry to an incessant bombardment of dire, doleful predictions and frightful allegations of the most horrible atrocities allegedly committed or

about to be committed by Germany. But a few of the many separate sources of these allegations were: Dr. Nahum Goldman, the Polish Government-in-exile, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Rabbi J.H. Herz, U.S. Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles, former Soviet Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinoff, the British Broadcasting Corporation, Mr. H. Wickham Steed (A British journalist who was active in anti-German propaganda during World War I and prior to World War II), and the U.S. War Refugee Board, organized and fully supported by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Although presenting no concrete evidence and identifying no "eye witnesses" (allegedly for reasons of wartime security), these charges were, as were the similar charges in World War I, generally accepted by Germany's enemies as valid—with the largely implied pledge that the ultimate proof of these allegations would be presented at the end of the war.

As the end of the war approached, almost every news release seemed to support these early accusations. With the discoveries made near the end of the war by the advancing United Nations armies of the heaps of corpses at Bergen-Belsen, Dachau, Buchenwald, Nordhausen, etc.—corpses, incidentally, predominantly Gentile, [2] and caused by disease, hunger, etc.—the self-righteous indignation of Germany's conquerors mounted to rage. The German Government itself, now headed by Grand Admiral Doenitz, was equally appalled and vowed to see justice done. Doenitz's Flensburg regime was aghast that after the fiasco of Allied accusations against Germany in World War I and the necessity of their subsequent refutation and withdrawal under fire after the war, charges of a similar type would again be brought seriously and again believed by the same enemies only thirty years later, this time as before without thorough prior investigation.

Viewing themselves quite early in the war, however, as avenging angels and anointed crusaders, expurgating and exterminating murderers and blasphemers, the United Nations conquerors thereupon reconsecrated themselves, as they had already sworn they would do, to fast and merciless punishment for anyone they deemed associated even remotely with these apparent crimes. Many United Nations protagonists, the older ones perhaps still smarting from their rebuff and rejection as a result of their false World War I charges, were certain in their own minds that *this time* Germany was obviously guilty of all allegations as charged—certain without even bothering to wait for the promised proof of these allegations. In their haste, the only questions they were concerned with were when and how far the victors should go in meting out the "new" justice. The London Agreements obviously had not solved all the problems. Stalin was suggesting, as he had been for some time, the summary killing of

50,000 German "war criminals," and the Americans were to learn later that Roosevelt had, at the 1943 Teheran conference, failed to take any umbrage whatever at this proposal. Missouri Representative Marion T. Bennett, in Europe with other U.S. Congressmen at General Eisenhower's special invitation, probably expressed the general, although not unanimous, feeling by saying: "I left Buchenwald convinced that every German must be killed." Joseph Pulitzer of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* advocated killing 1,500,000 "Nazis." Equally ominous for those Germans left alive (out of a nation originally comprising 80 million) was the announcement that four to six million of them faced trial by the United Nations as "war criminals"—presumably under the newly decreed *ex post facto* fiats of the United Nations London Agreements.

On 14 May 1945, the last legitimate German Government was completely dismantled by Germany's new masters and its members arrested pending trial and execution or imprisonment. The last possible source of even a whimper of protest against any abuse of Germans was thus adroitly silenced forever. The Allies had been cheated of their German "hanging bee" in 1918, but now as the "United Nations" they were determined to be neither cheated nor thwarted. Thus was the stage craftily set in Germany for a series of trials by unique military or "international" tribunals, artfully conceived, contrived and convened by the victors for the sole purpose of trying and punishing only the vanquished Germans, at the victors' pleasure, for "Crimes Against Humanity" and such other "crimes" recently enunciated or to be later unilaterally enunciated by the rationalizing, legalizing apologists of the victorious United Nations.

Dr. Bruno Tesch and his business manager-proxy ("Prokurist") Karl Weinbacher, who had never been members of the German Government or the German Armed Forces, were two of the first unfortunate Germans to become enmeshed in this newly-woven web of United Nations "new international justice."[3] It was their lot to be accused by the United Nations Occupation Authorities of having recommended the use of, and knowingly supplied, the poisonous Zyklon B for the purpose of killing the 4-4½ million Jews allegedly gassed at Auschwitz-Birkenau. This paper will discuss the official transcript of the British Military Tribunal which tried them and condemned them to death by hanging.

Of the numerous tribunals established by the United Nations for their multifaceted motives, the first Nuremberg Tribunal—the International Military Tribunal or IMT (also known as the Trial of Major War Criminals or TMWC), which was constituted to try the famous "first string" National Socialists—occupied center stage as intended, often eclipsing the events of other tribunals sitting at the same time. As a result of this, one fails often to

realize that these less-publicized "side" tribunals usually provided the Nuremberg Tribunals (both the IMT and the series of *American*-run Nuremberg Military Tribunals, or NMT) with much of the basic material used to formulate the concepts and support the arguments advanced by Robert H. Jackson, Telford Taylor and other United Nations prosecutors in their assignments at Nuremberg. In time, these concepts and arguments have, with some modifications necessitated already then by early revisionist research, congealed into what has become the monolithic corpus of the "Holocaust" gospel.

Pre-eminent in these side tribunals was the British Lueneburg Tribunal which undertook the trial of the Birkenau SS staff, whom the British Army had captured at the Bergen-Belsen Jewish transit camp. (See note 2.) This tribunal sat from 17 September 1945 to 17 November 1945, and at times its sensational headlines jeopardized the intended place of the Nuremberg IMT show on the front pages of the world's newspapers. It was at this British Military Tribunal that much of the "Holocaust" dogma and wartime tales of German bestiality were chiseled into the United Nations "Behistan Rock" to justify forever the United Nations acts *vis-a-vis* Germany. This was done by parading before the Tribunal a nondescript chorus of Yiddish voices, each chorus member seeking to gain for himself, for varied reasons, the prestigious role of a latter-day Judith or Esther, a Samson or Mordecai, and each seeking to outdo his predecessor on the witness stand with a horror tale of abuse and privation—naturally all unsubstantiated. It was here that the first United Nations prosecutor sought to establish legal credence and respectability for the earlier rumors of German bestiality and particularly the unsubstantiated allegations that 4,000,000 Jews had been killed at Auschwitz-Birkenau. It was here that physicians Ada Bimko and Charles Bendel made their bows on the front pages of the world's newspapers before figuring in the tribunal trying Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher—and after that disappearing, but leaving behind a legacy of falsehood and confusion which became, nevertheless, a part of the unquestioned, unchallengeable litany of the "Holocaust" credo.

A British officer serving the Defense at Lueneburg described these many witnesses as the dregs of eastern European ghettos; for this he was forced by the Tribunal to apologize. The British Tribunal at Lueneburg was described by Dr. Eberhard Kolb [4] in his book *Bergen-Belsen* as having carried out its work with "vorbildicher" (typical or exemplary) "Fairness" (fairness)—an opinion typical of a "new" or "reconstructed" German acceptable to the United Nations conquerors. What really concerned the British Tribunal and nearly everyone else at the time was not "Fairness," not facts, not justice but: "How will you kill

Kremer?"[5] The real trials had long since been completed in the newspapers, in the information bureaus and in the numerous conferences of the United Nations.

Among the United Nations, there was the almost universal desire to see as many Germans as possible put to ignominious death, and these United Nations Tribunals appeared to be useful vehicles for achieving this extirpation. Others openly favored *summary execution* of large numbers of Germans with no trial whatever.

The Bergen-Belsen Tribunal at Lueneburg and the trial of Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher are to some extent unique, since they represent some of the first and last vain attempts of the accused to tell the truth and thereby clear up the multitude of preposterous wartime charges disseminated by the United Nations for obvious propaganda objectives. *After the trials began, however, it soon became apparent that telling the truth was a fatal strategic error for the accused.* To *deny* that Jews had been maliciously killed *en masse* by Germany in a tribunal whose very existence was based upon the intent to establish without doubt that Jews *had been killed* was as fatal to the defendant in 1946 as it would have been to an accused medieval heretic who before his inquisitors guaranteed his condemnation on whatever charge by throwing in for the hell of it a denial of the existence of the Trinity and the Divinity of Jesus.

From the standpoint of survival, it was necessary for a witness to testify that Jews were certainly gassed, while attempting to save himself by protesting that his presence at that location or in that position entailed no responsibility and only incidental or accidental knowledge of the killings which, if observed, he was powerless to prevent.[6]

Such were the deplorable circumstances on 1 March 1946, when Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher were indicted and brought before the British Military Tribunal at Curiohaus, Hamburg.

Tesch und Stabenow

Dr. Tesch's association with Zyklon-B, the product whose sale was to result in his and Herr Weinbacher's execution, began long before the war. As a gifted graduate in chemistry, physics and mathematics at the University of Berlin, he had attained the position of assistant at the world-venerated Kaiser Wilhelm Institut. Here, he became interested in hydrogen cyanide as a fumigating agent. It was effective, but quite hazardous to use since it was a liquid and was chemically unstable. In addition, it was a deadly poison for humans. But it was this very deadliness to all animals which made it a nearly ideal fumigant. It killed not

only warm-blooded vermin quickly but also any eggs, larvae, pupa or adult insects which might be on the vermin or in the area being fumigated.[7]

With the support of the I.G. Farbenindustrie, Dr. Tesch, in conjunction with Dr. Gerhard Peters, initiated research which to a great extent, circumvented the problems which previously had long prevented the widespread use of hydrogen cyanide as a fumigating agent.

These problems were solved as follows: An irritant tear gas was mixed with the liquid hydrogen cyanide so as to "warn" anyone of the poison's presence.[8] After adding a chemical stabilizer, one part of this liquid was soaked into two parts of a porous, highly absorbant material so that the resulting mixture was not a liquid but solid, free-flowing granules. This product was named "Zyklon B,"[9] and the deadly fumes which evaporated slowly from the granules were called "Zyklon B gas." Chemically, this fumigating gas was nearly pure hydrogen cyanide diluted with air.

Zyklon B held such promise that it was patented by the I.G. Farbenindustrie and the patent assigned to the DEGESCH, the DEutsche GEsellschaft fuer SCHaedlingsbekaempfung (German Society for Pest Control), and it was they who were designated by the German Government to set the safety rules and standards for its use, necessarily stringent, because of the product's extreme lethal character. The DEGESCH also authorized shipment of the product to the user from the factory only after the Government regulations had been met. These regulations for using hydrogen cyanide for fumigation were relaxed only in specific instances deemed essential to the German Government. For purposes of fumigation, the German Military Forces in both World Wars were granted such a relaxation in regulations.[10]

With Herr Paul Stabenow, Dr. Tesch established the company in 1923 which later became fully his: Tesch und Stabenow. Dr. Peters accepted a leading position in the DEGESCH. Tesch und Stabenow was a pest-control company much like those in this country or in England. It sold primarily its pest-exterminating services and know-how. It did not manufacture Zyklon B nor the other chemicals it used in its fumigation service, but purchased them from the factories which produced them in volume.[11]

Prior to the war, Dr. Tesch's business grew rapidly, since with Zyklon B it was possible to fumigate entire ships, buildings, dwellings, mess halls, barracks, flour mills, grain elevators, railroad cars, etc.[12] successfully without damaging their contents. So long as these contents remained dry, Zyklon B gas did not harm them, and so long as the fumigated area was properly aired out after fumigation and the safety practices were followed faith-

fully, Zyklon B could be used satisfactorily and without danger to humans.

At the same time, similar operations were being carried out in the United States by domestic companies.[13] As Tesch und Stabenow prospered, at least six other similar firms sprang up in Germany. Of all pest-control firms, Tesch und Stabenow was an international leader, if not in fact *the* international leader. This was a result of Dr. Tesch's careful personal training of his employees in fumigation techniques and his uncompromising refusal to relax safety regulations.

In war, fumigation was even more important to Germany than in peace. Besides the many pressing needs of the Wehrmacht, the Luftwaffe, and the Navy, there were additional civilian needs. Any dwelling or building which was vacated for any reason might require fumigation before new tenants could occupy it. In addition, the camps established for the huge numbers of foreign workers and repatriated Germans from the east—all under the care of the SS—required frequent fumigation. The importance of these fumigation operations can further be gaged by the fact that men employed as fumigators were exempt from military draft. Of the 50 or so employees of Tesch und Stabenow at the start of the war, thirty-five were involved with fumigation operations. Herr Weinbacher himself had begun work at the company as a fumigator and had, through hard work, become Dr. Tesch's assistant.

Although the fumigation / pest-control business was profitable, in war it was not without headaches. Besides the shortages of personnel, materials, equipment, etc., Tesch und Stabenow, because of the acute German manpower shortages, was assigned the additional task of assisting the DEGESCH in processing orders from those seeking to use Zyklon B. The German Government made this arbitrary assignment since Tesch und Stabenow already placed regular, large orders for Zyklon B through the DEGESCH, and this simplified the Government's role in policing compliance with existing Government regulations and reduced the work load on the DEGESCH. As a condition of continuing as a licensed fumigator, Dr. Tesch was legally obligated to receive and process all Zyklon B orders from users east of the Elbe River. This unwelcome additional task represented a division of the paper work associated with *ordering* rather than of manufacturing or supplying. In a similar arrangement, areas west of the Elbe River had their orders initially processed by Hirt und Linkler before they were submitted to the DEGESCH.

After checking the orders to see if potential buyers were authorized users of Zyklon B, the orders were forwarded by Tesch und Stabenow to the DEGESCH [14] where the buyer's Government authorization and compliance with regulations were rechecked.

Then, they were allocated whatever percentage of their order Dr. Peters [15] and his allocation committee at the DEGESCH decided upon, and the order was finally placed with the factory. Allocation was necessary since Zyklon B, like all other chemicals, was always in short supply. [16] Military orders were always given preference over civilian usage, and these orders were filled from wherever supplies might be available at the time—east or west of the Elbe River.

In performing this order-processing function, Dr. Tesch was required to pay cash immediately when an order processed by him was placed at the factory, and he received his money back plus a small commission three to four months later when the Zyklon B was delivered.

For German Government orders, Tesch und Stabenow received initially a fee of 10% of the gross amount of the order. This fee was set by the Government. After May 1943, this fee was cut to 2½%, and after 1943, the service of Tesch und Stabenow was dispensed with entirely by virtue of the Government's assignment solely to the Wehrmacht Hauptsanitaetspark (Wehrmacht Main Sanitary Depot), Berlin, the function of supplying Zyklon B to *all* Government users.

Interrogation and Charge

Dr. Tesch first became aware of his impending ordeal with the United Nations Occupation Authorities when a British Captain, Anton W. Freud, [17] visited him in his office with Emil Sehm, one of his former bookkeepers, and interrogated him in German. At this meeting, Sehm accused his former employer of supplying Zyklon B to kill Jews. Dr. Tesch denied the accusation emphatically, and accused Sehm of knowing full well that Zyklon B was used only in pest-control. Dr. Tesch was left in peace for a few days, but on 3 September 1945, he was arrested and interrogated further before being released on 1 October 1945. On 6 October 1945, he was re-arrested by the British and remained thereafter in their custody until his execution. On 31 October 1945, Dr. Tesch signed a deposition. It was taken in the standard British manner with oral translation from German into English. These on-the-spot oral translations were written down and became the official—and *only*—record. Afterward, Captain Freud said that the deposition was signed voluntarily and Dr. Tesch had signed after only minor changes. But Dr. Tesch testified later that he had signed only because he "felt under some pressure" and after receiving an indication that later, other explanatory changes in the deposition would be made. It is not difficult to believe that any German being interrogated at this time on this subject by a

British officer named "Freud" might, indeed, feel "under some pressure."

The Tribunal

On the basis of Captain Freud's interrogations, the British War Crimes officials decided to prosecute Dr. Tesch, Herr Weinbacher and Dr. Joachim Drosihn.[18] A British Military Tribunal was accordingly ordered convened by Sir Henry MacGeagh. C.L. Stirling, who already had served as Judge Advocate at the British trial of the Birkenau SS staff at Lueneburg was again named Judge Advocate. R.B.L. Persee was named President and Lt. Col. Sir Geoffrey Palmer and Major S.M. Johnson were named as members of the Tribunal. Capt. H.S. Marshall was designated as a waiting member.

On Friday, 1 March 1946, the Tribunal convened in Curiohaus, Hamburg. *It was a trial which had to be held* if the "Holocaust" allegations were ever to be anything more than malevolent tales conjured up by imaginative, vengeful inmates, escapees, war propagandists, and so forth, all with sinister, self-serving motivations and intents. It was a time during which Germany's recent conquerors were frantically scrambling to find the bricks with which to erect the all-absolving "Holocaust" edifice they needed so desperately. It was a desperation born of a compelling urgency to justify their own past and future acts in Germany and elsewhere throughout the world as world powers, and to secure permanently the undisputed mastery [19] of Germany and Central Europe which they enjoyed in 1945 as a result of the bloody conflagration.

It must be pointed out that, regarding anything said in German (or French) at the Tribunal, we at this later date are at the mercy of the three translators and the three court reporters as to the accuracy of the translations and of the record. All Tribunal records were kept in English.

In accordance with decrees of the United Nations Occupation Forces, no former members of the NSDAP might practice law. Therefore all defense attorneys had to be free—in the minds of the prosecuting victors at least—of the slightest hint of NSDAP taint. In practice, potential difficulties were usually avoided by the tribunals' allowing only attorneys with actual *anti*-NSDAP histories to defend the accused. The defense attorneys were therefore from the beginning politically and ideologically hostile to those they were to defend![20] Alternatively, the accused could have elected to be defended by a British officer as was done in Lueneburg at the trial of the Birkenau SS staff. (With the result that most of these were executed!) Civilian English attorneys

were at this time strongly discouraged if not forbidden from acting in defense of German nationals in United Nations war crimes tribunals.

The German (anti-NSDAP) Defense personnel, many of whom did not comprehend English fully, were required to follow *British* court procedure which was totally foreign to them. Their handicap was often so apparent that Major G.I.D. Draper, the British prosecutor, and even the British Judge Advocate, C.L. Stirling, felt compelled at times to ask the Defense if they did not have questions at particular points. This was a strange trial indeed. It should also be borne in mind that in the German Law of the Third Reich, the Prosecution was obligated by law to present any evidence in its possession which was favorable to the defendant. In the post-World War II War Crimes Trials in Germany, this was emphatically *not* the case. When queried on this point at Nuremberg by the German Defense, the American Prosecutor, Robert H. Jackson, stated that so allowing would entail the Prosecution's "serving two masters"![21] The realistic objective of the United Nations prosecutors was not one of finding facts and arriving at verdicts justified by those facts but that of obtaining, by whatever means necessary, the testimony and evidence vital to support a *preordained* verdict. The well-known precepts of the Vishinsky-Moscow Trials were thus brought from the banks of the Moskva to the banks of the Regnitz.

From beginning to end, the Tribunal assumed the timbre of a dialog between victor and vanquished, between judge and culprit. And although after a period in which he would show characteristic British disdain and contempt for his anti-NSDAP German adversaries, Major Draper might refer to them as "my learned friends of the German Bar," there was never, ever, any question as to whose hand held the gun. (And the scales.) Draper could lecture the German Defense as much as he pleased on the awful burden placed upon the Prosecution by British Law in requiring proof of the charges beyond all reasonable doubt, but there was never the slightest challenge to his continual statements that four million Jews were wantonly and purposefully killed by Germany at Auschwitz, that the alleged Gestapo and SS excesses were common and well-known practices, that foreign workers who came to Germany were in fact "slaves," and so on. Actually, the British Judge Avocate Stirling, having performed his appointed task at Lueneburg so well, sometimes joined in the accusations himself. These allegations were already being accepted by the Tribunal as incontrovertable fact, with only Dr. Charles Sigismund Bendel (a self-declared authority on Auschwitz-Birkenau who had testified previously at Lueneburg) and SS-Rottenfuehrer Perry Broad giving anything approaching actu-

al supporting, eye-witness evidence for the alleged mass murder at Auschwitz and Birkenau.

The interpreters were in continual difficulty. Providing accurate, instantaneous, oral translations—in a situation where a man's life may depend on the proper evaluation of a voice inflection, choice of the proper word, etc.,—will always pose insurmountable technical difficulties. The interpreters had the further infuriating habit of using the word "gassing" whenever they obviously meant "fumigation" or "gassing" in the sense alleged in the "Holocaust" allegations. The stratagem achieved its desired effect in the United Nations press, but here and in numerous other places, had records also been kept in German, I am certain there would have been numerous conflicts in the trial records.

Testimony

Of the witnesses called by the British Prosecution, Emil Sehm presented the testimony which was most deadly to Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher. Sehm had been a bookkeeper at Tesch und Stabenow. It may actually have been he who initially contacted the British and denounced Dr. Tesch. Such actions were openly solicited by the United Nations. Sehm testified that in the Fall of 1942, while looking in the firm files for something entirely different, he came across a pink or red copy of a trip report which implicated Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher, as Tesch's proxy, in mass murder. In testifying to the alleged typed report, Sehm swore:

> Dr. Tesch speaks about an interview he had with leading personalities of the German Wehrmacht. I remember a phrase saying that "Herr . . ."—I do not remember the name—"told me that the shooting of Jews is growing more and more frequent and the burial of the great number is proving to be more and more unhygienic. To change this, it is proposed that the extermination of the Jews should be done now through the efforts of the prussic acid." Dr. Tesch, asked to give, concerning this idea some propositions "I, Dr. Tesch proposed to use prussic acid just as it is used for the elimination of vermin, to use it for the above mentioned purpose."
>
> Then, it is explained that those to be exterminated should be put into a previously prepared barracks, prepared in the same way as for the extermination of vermin. During the night some expert in this prussic acid gas method prepares the barracks, which are then later closed against intruding air. The next morning those who have been exterminated through this gas can be got rid of. I must add that in the beginning of the report it was mentioned that the Jews need not be buried, but they would be burned. Dr. Tesch takes these orders to train SS personnel in these matters concerning prussic acid gas.

Much of Sehm's testimony can be challenged for accuracy and consistency. It describes only very vaguely the basic killing procedure accepted and preached by the "Holocaust" high priesthood, and some of it even conflicts with or refutes their accepted stories. Nevertheless, it contains the fertile seeds necessary for gestating the "Holocaust" tales. These were:

- Identification of Dr. Tesch as the person who recommended as early as 1942 the use of Zyklon B in gas chambers as a more effective means of killing as opposed to shooting (or as opposed to the use of carbon monoxide, *a la* the testimony of Auschwitz Commandant Rudolf Hoess).
- Equation of Jews with vermin, with the implication that both were to be exterminated as pests by pest-control procedures.
- Identification of the SS as the agency responsible for killing Jews (although he also seems to attempt to implicate the Wehrmacht!).
- Disposal of Jewish corpses by cremation ("more hygienic").

The criteria for evaluating the acceptability of Sehm's testimony must be to judge his personal reliability and honesty, to check for unquestionable verification by reliable witnesses, and finally to judge its credibility and cohesiveness.

The pink copy of the alleged travel report supposedly written in the Fall of 1942 and allegedly seen by Sehm was, according to him, burned purposely along with a white original and a second pink copy—both of which no one ever saw—when the firm files were destroyed in a bombing attack on 20 March 1945. Prior to the bombing, these files were open to everyone in the office and were locked only at night. If he had so wished, Sehm could easily have removed an entire copy even easier than he alleges he made notes from the copy he swore he saw. No one would have been wiser.

All the steno-typists of Tesch und Stabenow were questioned. If such a travel report had ever existed, one of them would have had to have taken it down in dictation and then type it in triplicate. All testified, however, that they had never seen nor typed such a report. One typist, Frau Anna Uenzelmann, testified that she had once understood Dr. Tesch to have said after a dictation session that he'd heard in Berlin that people were killed by Zyklon B, but there was no elaboration on his part as to whether this was accidental or not. Dr. Tesch did not even remember the incident. Another typist, Frl. Eliza Biagini, testified that she had once read in a travel report of human beings being killed by

Zyklon B at Sachsenhausen-Oranienburg. This event was poorly recalled and may have been actually a question put to Dr. Tesch during one of his classes at this camp. This testimony may also have been the result of an attempt by Sehm to intimidate the witness during her pre-trial interrogation by the British. At this interrogation, Sehm, obviously playing a leading role, falsely alleged that he had the missing, incriminating travel document from Dr. Tesch in his pocket.

The importance of the testimony from these two typists, however, is that *neither* corroborates Sehm's testimony. For that matter, they do not even support each other. All three testimonies clearly involve entirely separate and different places and events, uncorroborated by any other testimony!

"Substantiation" of Sehm's testimony rested completely on the testimony of three of his close, old friends: Wilhelm and Kate Pook and Bernhard Frahm. Sehm alleged that he showed to the Pooks the notes he made from the red or pink file copy at Tesch und Stabenow. He visited both regularly to discuss religion, politics, National Socialism, and other subjects, and they testified that they remembered "seeing" the notes. Under oath, Frau Pook testified first that she had seen the actual travel report itself. But when questioned further, she could say with certainty only that she had seen a "document," and excused her mistake by blaming the passage of four years for her uncertainty. On the advice of Wilhelm Pook, Sehm had allegedly burned his notes in an ash tray on the Pook's table.

Wilhelm Pook testified that Sehm had told him that Dr. Tesch was profiting in the range of RM20,000 to RM25,000 per quarter on Zyklon B sales alone.[22]

Even more remarkable and pertinent to the reliability of Sehm's testimony was the fact that both the Pooks, when first interrogated by the British, had forgotten completely to even mention the all-important incriminating "notes" or "travel report." Thereafter, after Sehm's first appearance before the military tribunal, the Pooks had discussed with him his testimony prior to their appearance before the Tribunal. When questioned closely, Frau Pook admitted that she didn't remember who had reminded whom (she Sehm, or Sehm her) that the "document" had been burned in an ash tray on her table. After such a discrediting group of admissions by witnesses called by the British military prosecutor to give credence to Sehm's testimony, all Major Draper could do was ask Wilhelm Pook if he had told the truth, to which he answered "Yes." Both Pooks were then hurried out of the Tribunal.

Draper sought further to establish the credibility of Sehm's testimony by calling another of the latter's close friends, Bernhard Frahm.[23] Sehm alleged that several months after he burned his notes at the Pook's dwelling, he told Frahm of what he had found in the Tesch und Stabenow files. Herr Frahm professed to remember the occasion, but admitted he himself had not seen the incriminating notes written by Sehm. He added, however—certainly to the gratification of the Tribunal—that the Nazis considered anyone who opposed them to be "vermin"[24] or "Schaedlinger." He said that Sehm had told him Tesch und Stabenow were delivering gas and "stoves"[25] to kill humans.

This was the flimsy substance of Emil Sehm's testimony against Dr. Tesch und Herr Weinbacher. No more substantial—rather less so—was the testimony of those called to substantiate it. Of four bookkeepers at Tesch und Stabenow, Sehm was the least important. He was a short-term employee and was quite dissatisfied with his position. Accordingly, he had requested to be released by his employer so that he might return to Koenigsberg, East Prussia, his native city, where he hoped to start a tax consulting business. Dr. Tesch, who was having difficulty finding employees in wartime, refused to release him, incurring as a result his hatred and wrath. In addition to being anti-NSDAP as were his friends, the Pooks and Frahm, Sehm already had cause to dislike if not hate Dr. Tesch, who was a Party member. Although he professed no ill will toward Dr. Tesch for refusing to release him, he described his former employer as an "intellectual sadist."

Of the witnesses who knew Dr. Tesch, however, only Sehm and Dr. Drosihn—the latter only after some prodding by Major Draper—spoke ill of him. It is difficult to escape the feeling that this was just one more instance where the end of the war, with its confusion and its bloody tribunals, was seized upon, as it must have been by many, as an opportunity to settle old, long-standing scores in those parts of Europe overrun by United Nations forces.

It seems quite obvious that the incriminating parts of Sehm's testimony are monsterous fabrications. Sensing the completely irresponsible character of this testimony, Dr. Zippel, who defended Dr. Tesch, lost no time in denouncing Sehm as a liar, and after offering examples to the Tribunal in which he had certainly lied under oath, proceeded to deal with the other testimony, believing that of Sehm to have been completely discredited. In the end, however, it was Sehm's incredible accusations in the hands of the British prosecutor, Draper, which provided all the substance the Military Tribunal wanted to tie Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher to the "Holocaust" juggernaut.

The next "witness" was Dr. Rudolf Diels who, because of his on-going interrogations for the Nuremberg Tribunal, could not be present at the Curiohaus Tribunal. His affidavit—also in English—was submitted in lieu of his appearance. This maneuver was used over and over again by those dedicated to the unquestioning service to "one master,"[26] because of its efficacy in shielding from cross-examination by the Defense those witnesses deemed weak or unreliable by the Prosecution. It was only much later that the Defense could force the appearances of such "witnesses" for cross-examination.

Dr. Diels's affidavit appears to be the German origin of the famous expression, "You'd better watch out or you'll go up the chimney!" This related to threats of death followed by cremation made to inmates by concentration camp guards. Diels swore that "in his opinion," gassing operations (presumably killing humans) were being talked about practically everywhere in Germany. His revelation that Zyklon B was manufactured in Hamburg was news to Dr. Tesch who, as a user, would have been happy to know of a nearby supplier. (There was, of course, no such factory in Hamburg.)

Before being arrested by the Gestapo, first in March and again in August 1944, Dr. Diels had been President of Koeln und Hannover and then Chief of the Shipping Division of the Hermann Goering Works. His deposition, like that of Wilhelm Hoettl, fairly reeks of his desire to provide his captors with the evidence they so ardently sought. It is a curious mixture of what the occupation authorities already knew or believed they knew and what is little better than common gossip—so much so that Stirling, the British Judge Advocate, protested at having to hear all of it. Dr. Diels's affidavit was useful to the British Military Tribunal, however, in "establishing" the point that Germans such as Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher (neither of whom Diels knew) could not but have helped knowing that Jews were being killed with Zyklon B gas.

Far from it being common knowledge in Germany that people were being gassed, as Diels alleged, the vast majority of Germans were horrified by the United Nations accusations and they protested that they had never heard of such acts until after the cessation of hostilities when they had begun listening to United Nations broadcasts. They were, as mentioned previously, even more horrified to learn that the same enemies could after a mere thirty years again believe them capable of such deeds. Since the British Broadcasting Corporation had been broadcasting these accusations regularly for many months before the end of the war, those Germans who had "common knowledge" of the gassing before the war's end most likely got this "knowledge" from the BBC! This may explain at least a part of Dr. Diels's difficulties

with the Gestapo, since the German authorities, who regularly recorded and monitored the United Nations propaganda broadcasts,[27] checking them for accuracy if deemed necessary, usually equated knowledge of the contents of these broadcasts with having listened illegally to them, or having associated with persons who had.

Diels's affidavit was followed by testimony from a number of Tesch und Stabenow employees. Among these were Frl. Biagini and Frau Uenzelmann, mentioned previously in connection with Sehm's testimony. The other steno-typists were also questioned about the travel report allegedly seen by Sehm, but none had typed or seen or heard of it. Besides office workers, field workers who had done contract fumigations at Auschwitz and other camps supervised by the SS were heard. No evidence was given, however, which supported the view that Tesch und Stabenow was anything other than a respected, reliable, busy, well-run pest-control firm.

The testimony of Wilhelm Bahr is of interest since, as an SS sanitation orderly from Neuengamme concentration camp, he, with nineteen others, had taken Dr. Tesch's short three-day course in fumigation with Zyklon B, using for training the fumigation chambers for clothing articles at the SS hospital at Oranienburg. These standard fumigation chambers had a volume of ten cubic meters and held from 40 to 50 pieces of clothing per charge.[28] This was the clothing normally from about 25 to 30 people. A fumigation chamber of this size required one 200 gram can[29] of Zyklon B to give the required gas concentration of 20 grams of Zyklon B gas per cubic meter of air.[30]

Bahr testified that Dr. Tesch did not train him and his colleagues specifically in killing humans, but he, Bahr, acting on orders from a Dr. von Bergmann (presumably a physician), killed 200 Russian prisoners-of-war with Zyklon B gas at Neuengamme once in 1942 by pouring five or six tins of Zyklon B (presumably 200 gram tins) into a barrack from a hole in its roof. In addition, he stated that he had seen the name of Tesch und Stabenow on the labels of cans of Zyklon B which he used at Neuengamme apparently for both fumigation operations and for the single admitted killing of Russian POW's.[31] Bahr was the single witness who definitely placed Zyklon B ordered through Tesch und Stabenow at the site of an alleged mass killing operation. This site, however, was at Neuengamme, not Auschwitz.

It is a tortured reasoning indeed which holds Dr. Tesch (and even more illogically, Herr Weinbacher) responsible for the alleged murders of 200 Russians killed by a man who confesses to the murder but testifies that a Dr. Von Bergmann ordered him to do it and that Dr. Tesch didn't train him to do it. If one believes

that Bahr did in fact kill the Russians, Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher certainly had no responsibility. But, again, it was all the British Military Tribunal needed to establish firmly in the minds of the "Holocaust" disciples the mental picture of the sadistic SS sanitation orderly fiendishly dumping Zyklon B, ordered through Tesch und Stabenow, through openings in the ceiling into a chamber packed with pitiful, unsuspecting, for once *Russian* victims! (An occasional later variation on this main theme alleges that Zyklon B was added through wall ports.)

Unterscharfuehrer (Corporal) Wilhelm Friedrich Bahr was himself awaiting trial for war crimes before a later British Military Tribunal.[32] Doubtless, he had been made aware of the seriousness of the charges against him and that his only possible chance of survival lay in accomodating his captors. As yet I have not discovered his subsequent fate.

The testimony of Rottenfuehrer (Lance-corporal) Perry (Pery) Broad at Dr. Tesch's trial constitutes one of the most oft-cited and relied-upon supports for the charges of mass murder of Jews by Germans at Auschwitz-Zasole and Auschwitz-Birkenau. Along with his "Report"[33] and his testimony, he is responsible for the establishment of several concepts essential to the vivification and sustained vigor of the "Holocaust" tales. Broad testified that already in 1942 he had heard rumors that gassing was being carried out "on a bigger scale" at Auschwitz-Zasole. He stated that he observed an actual "gassing" from the Truppenrevier (troop quarters) at a distance of 40-45 meters. This was in July of 1942. Several people in gas masks were on the roof of the old crematorium. They hammered open tins (presumably of Zyklon B) and poured the contents into *six* holes each *ten centimeters* (four inches) in diameter[34] leading apparently through the roof to a chamber underneath. Broad alleged that 300 to 500 people were in the "Old Crematorium." After 2-3 minutes, the screaming ended. He *assumed* that people were killed in this manner once or twice a month, but stated that he actually witnessed only one "gassing" this closely. He testified that in the Fall of 1944, he had observed "gassing" at Auschwitz-Birkenau but from a much greater distance. At Birkenau, he testified, there were *four* crematories,[35] and in March and April of 1944, 19,000 persons a day were killed with Zyklon B from tin cans. He said he was certain tin cans were used because he saw the cans in a car driven by a disinfector who had given him a ride. But he could not identify the labels on the cans as identifying material ordered through Tesch und Stabenow.

Broad estimated that a total of 2½ to 3 million Jews from Belgium, Holland, France, Northern Italy, Czechoslovakia and Poland, as well as Gypsies and German deportees, had been

killed at Auschwitz-Birkenau. These victims included babies and the elderly. Broad's testimony supported the notion that "selection" meant instant death in a gas chamber upon arrival without registration at the camp.[36] Cremation allegedly followed.

The capacities of the crematory/gas-chambers, according to Broad who admitted he was never in one, were as follows: Birkenau crematories I and II—3,000 to 4,000 people each in underground rooms. Birkenau crematories III and IV—2,000 each at ground level. Birkenau crematory V had a capacity, he said, of 800 to 1,200 people but contained only a *gas stove*. He asserted that his detailed information came from guards and from the fact that he had witnessed barrack fumigations and *assumed* that procedure to be the same as that used in killing. (See Bendel's testimony, below.) Broad continued that the killing was actually done by the fumigators or disinfectors who fumigated clothing. He testified that in 1942 and 1943, the bodies, so far as possible, were cremated in crematories.[37] Thereafter, they were burned on pyres in the open air, since the crematories had insufficient capacities. Broad declared that the clothing from the victims was sent to the Volksdeutschemittlestelle. The killing was allegedly carried out using two of the larger (1 kilogram) tins.[38] Broad testified that in March and April of 1944, trains were lined up at Birkenau waiting to make their deliveries of humans to the gas chambers. Three hours were allegedly required to process a load of victims through the gas chambers and the crematories.

What Perry Broad's testimony, as a former member of the SS, accomplished was to give vital muscle and life to the feeble, anemic statements of Sehm and to what previously had only been suspect, irresponsible, and disconnected allegations by United Nations propagandists. An argumentatively supportable, although admittedly far-fetched, killing operation was described in which nameless, faceless, unidentifiable millions were marched unrecognized, uncounted, and unregistered en masse from countless trains straightaway into waiting gas chambers, and there killed with Zyklon B and cremated—passing from illusory, allegedly uncontested existence into the dusty oblivion of "Holocaust" immortality in the short space of three hours. This testimony must have removed any lingering hesitation from the "searching" minds of the British Military Tribunal, straining to substantiate the wartime propaganda allegations and upon whose verdict Dr. Tesch's and Herr Weinbacher's lives unfortunately depended. The Tribunal must now have felt absolutely secure in declaring that "German monsters" had "gassed" six million helpless Jews. Broad had provided them with a position which, although admittedly controversial, was argumentatively supportable in that it probably could not be disproved unequivo-

cally in minds eager to believe it and, therefore, all other facts could and would be fitted somehow into this overall, general picture, distorted though it might be in some particulars.

Rottenfuehrer Perry Broad was himself in jeopardy on at least two counts. As a Brazilian citizen serving as an SS volunteer, he could have been executed for treason in time of war. As a member of the SS detachment at Auschwitz he, having already miraculously escaped death at capture, was a prime candidate for at least a Soviet labor camp for an undetermined number of years—if he was ever surrendered to Soviet control. Unless he mollified his captors, a train trip to Vienna via the U.S.-run concentration camp at Eppensee [39] and finally to Russia, a trip many others in the SS had taken, was a strong probability. Broad did what he deemed necessary for his survival.

A close study of his testimony and his "Report" discloses many fallacies and contradictions, many of which must have been apparent to the British Tribunal. Suspicion of that small remainder of his evidence was justified by the fact that at the Frankfurt "Auschwitz Trial" in 1964-1965, he did exactly what numerous other witnesses did who had had testimony exacted from them by threats, coercion, or promises. (Those, that is, who were afterward allowed to live.) At a later date, feeling no longer the danger of imminent death, imprisonment or deportation at the hands of enraged, unrestrained captors, *he denounced large portions of his earlier, life-saving testimony as being based upon what he had heard rather than upon what he had witnessed.* This about-face led Hannah Arendt and others at the time of the "Auschwitz Trial" [40] to describe Broad in terms much less complimentary than those used by Major Draper at the Curiohaus proceedings. [41]

Of the accusing cacophony heard at the British Lueneburg Tribunal, only two witnesses, on reflection by the Prosecution, were chosen to give testimony at the trial of Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher. The first of these was Dr. Charles Sigismund Bendel. In general, he supported the gross allegations made by Broad, although tending to conflict with him on specific points. Declaring himself an authority on Birkenau, he seemed to imply that he, as a physican, obtained his information either from being part of, or in charge of, the 900-man "Sonderkommando" which allegedly operated the crematories. From his testimony, it appears that the German term for this commando unit may have been "Hilflinger," or "helpers." He asserted that during the almost twelve months he was at Birkenau, the Germans killed one million people with Zyklon B, and that he performed post mortems on some of these victims. May, June, and July of 1944, he asserted, were the months of greatest killing activity. At the peak, in June,

25,000 persons were killed each day. Between May and June of 1944, he declared, 400,000 were killed, and a further 80,000 between 15 July and 1 September 1944. Dr. Bendel alleged that he witnessed the killing process itself, which, he said, was carried out by SS volunteers. Transports of 300 or fewer persons were shot; larger groups were "gassed" in the crematories or the "Bunker." In contrast to Broad, Dr. Bendel placed the capacities of Birkenau's crematory-gas chambers I and II at 2,000 each. Birkenau crematories III and IV [42] allegedly held 1,000 each, while a "Bunker"—not Broad's "crematory V"—held 1,000.

Bendel testified that both underground chambers in crematories I and II were used for gassing and said the gas was added "from the roof, and it came straight down until it touched the floor." The 2,000 victims were packed naked into these two 10 meter by 4 meter by 1.72 meter chambers, their clothes having previously been taken from them for fumigation at Auschwitz-Zasole in a facility known to him. After killing, Bendel alleged, the hair was cut off the victims and the gold was taken from their dental work. He testified that the yield of gold during the lifetime of the camp was 17 tons (17,000 kg.) from four million victims.

Further, Dr. Bendel stated that during the entire two years of his imprisonment by the Germans, he observed only *one* [43] fumigation of a barracks with Zyklon B. "Lisoform," (apparently a cresol derivative similar to "Lysol") was the material used by the Germans for disinfection, he said. Zyklon B was used solely for killing people, and two 1 kilogram tin canisters were used in each of the underground chambers. He stated that a 1 kilogram can of Zyklon B was capable of killing 500 people, [44] so at a rate of 25,000 killings per day, fifty 1 kilogram tins of the material were required per day. The bodies of the victims were thrown into cremation pits where, after one hour, they had become ashes and disappeared.[45] Finally, Dr. Bendel testified that the Zyklon B was brought into the camp in a Red Cross van but was not delivered by the Red Cross itself.

Dr. Bendel was a Rumanian-Jewish physician who had been arrested in Paris on 4 November 1943, and sent to Drancy. On 10 December 1943, as a result of his not having French citizenship and as a result of his anti-German activities, he was shipped "east" to Auschwitz as a danger to the German war effort. He was an inmate in Auschwitz-Zasole, Auschwitz-Buna (Monowitz) and Auschwitz-Birkenau before evacuation to Mauthausen. He was at Birkenau from 27 February 1943 until January 1944. As a physician at Birkenau and a member of—perhaps even a leader of—the crematory "Sonderkommando" or "Hilflinger," he held a position envied by the other inmates, since he had special privileges (special quarters, special food, etc.) and was always sus-

pected of collaboration with the Germans. This collaboration indeed seems probable, since he admitted at Lueneburg that he had obtained his position at Birkenau through the efforts of Dr. Mengele. Quite possibly, with all the disease in the camp and the eternal shortage of physicians—and considering that he claimed to have done post mortem examinations—he may have been one of Dr. Mengele's helpers or "Hilflinger."

Bendel's fantastic testimony can be challenged for many factual transgressions. He professed to know a lot about the killing operation, but he limits his details to the operation of Birkenau crematories I and II and completely omits any detail of the operations in crematories III and IV [46] and the ever-elusive "Bunker." He does not even betray the "Bunker's" location. His allegations that both underground rooms in each of crematories I and II were gas chambers conflicts totally with the process described by the Auschwitz Museum authorities who aver that only one room which had one small entry door served this purpose.[47] It is the Auschwitz Museum version which is supported by the OSS/CIA pictures released in 1979 showing single "gas chambers" each with four "gas shafts" attached to crematories I and II.

Inconsistencies and impossibilites, however, apparently did not bother Dr. Bendel. His additional statements under cross-examination that 1,000 naked bodies could be crammed into some 64 cubic meters "by the German technique" and that "four million people who were gassed at Auschwitz are the witnesses" completely cowed and intimidated the German Defense. The Defense on precisely these points, and on numerous others, should have then and there ripped his testimony to shreds. Instead, at one point when it appeared that Bendel might be backed into a corner by the anti-NSDAP German Defense and forced to give a detailed answer to a question about a previous accusation, he was allowed to make *another* horrendous accusation, and thereby avoided giving a detailed explanation of *either* accusation. As it was, his statements were a series of gratifying bonuses for the British Military Tribunal with its predestined objective, and "Chutzpah" triumphed again! [48]

Dr. Sigismund Bendel, who gave his testimony in French, hoping perhaps thereby to eventually gain French citizenship, gave testimony generally much less believable than that of Broad. The use of three languages obviously increased translation difficulties, but such difficulties could not possibly result in the gross error and fantastic physical impossibilities brazenly stated in his testimony. [49]

The very effective United Nations practice of introducing affidavits *in lieu of witnesses who could be cross-examined* was again resorted to in the case of the second "witness" from the

British Military Tribunal at Lueneburg, Dr. Ada Bimko. Being indisposed because of "acute angina pectorum," she could not parade before the Curiohaus Tribunal as she had done at Lueneburg, but her testimony was presented in the form of the two affidavits which she had already presented at Lueneburg. One of these affidavits stated that Zyklon B gas from a cylinder was run through pipes into and out of shower heads to kill the unsuspecting victims, who were expecting a shower bath. [50] Dr. Bimko was quite certain of herself, since she had observed no floor drains in the shower rooms, thus making them without question "gas chambers." She swore that records of the camp, secretly kept by the inmates themselves, and which she had examined, showed that about 4,000,000 persons had been cremated. She also swore that an SS Unterscharfuehrer whose name she had forgotten but who was a member of the camp medical staff had shown her the "crematory-gas chamber." She also refered to *five* crematories at Birkenau.

Dr. Ada Bimko was a Jewish physician from Sosnowitz, Poland, who had been at Auschwitz. Her depositions are freely sprinkled with "I was told's" and "They said's." On the sixth day of the Lueneburg Tribunal, she admitted that before her transfer to the Bergen-Belsen transit camp, she had been in charge of the Birkenau inmate hospital in Section B-3 ("Mexiko"), a fairly responsible job. Quite likely, she was in the same precarious position as Dr. Bendel—attempting to do sufficient penance with services rendered to placate the wrath of her co-religionists—and she went on obligingly from addendum to addendum in her depositions. There are four addenda in one deposition! This penance maneuver worked in many, perhaps even in most, cases. Thus it was all the more noteworthy when it occasionally failed, as it did in the case of Dr. Rezsoe (Rudolf) Kastner of the Budapest Zionist Relief Committee.

In her haste and eagerness to satisfy her interrogators, Dr. Bimko had unwittingly performed a service for the later historical revisionists. She actually described not Birkenau crematories I and II, which without question were crematories, but the buildings which the Germans described as "Badeanstalt fuer Sonderaktion," commonly referred to by the "Holocaust" historians as Birkenau crematoriums III and IV. The description given by Dr. Bimko sounds, for those who have seen it, very similar to a description of the shower installation at Dachau [51]—a concrete ceiling with rows of spray fittings, i.e., a shower bath!

The testimony of Alfred Zaun, the head bookkeeper at Tesch und Stabenow, established the quantities of Zyklon B ordered through them for various users (Tables I-III). Figures were available for 1942 and 1943, since, as has been noted, after 1943 all

German Government users drew their supplies of Zyklon B from the Wehrmacht Hauptsanitaetspark in Berlin. This new supply arrangement started, therefore, some two months before Dr. Bendel arrived at Birkenau!

In 1942, Tesch und Stabenow ordered a grand total of 79,069.9 kg. of Zyklon B; in 1943, 119,458.4 kg. This involved a total of 9,131.6 kg. to all camps in 1942 and 18,302.9 kg. in 1943. The Auschwitz complex received 7,500 kg. in 1942 and 12,000 kg. in 1943. At the same time, the Wehrmacht Hauptsanitaetspark in Berlin, [52] which after 1943 supplied all Government users, received 11,232.0 kg. in 1942 and 19,982.0 kg. in 1943—a larger quantity in both years than the combined total for the concentration camps. These German Government orders had taken precedence over other orders from Norway for 5,794 kg. in 1942 and 12,004 kg. in 1943 as well as orders from the Finnish Army for 7,052.5 kg. in 1942 and 10,000.5 kg. in 1943.

Enormous as these quantities are in light of their unquestioned capacity to kill humans, [53] they are insufficiently small when considered in light of the huge fumigation [54] and delousing job that had to be accomplished just to keep epidemics at bay. Since Zyklon B could always be used to good advantage, much more of the material was normally ordered than could possibly be delivered. It simply was impossible to get more of it in wartime, shortage-ridden Germany regardless of the need. An idea of the degree of this shortage can be gained from the Finnish Army order in 1942. They ordered 15,000 kg. and received a mere 7,052.5 kg. As the war continued, the shortages grew more acute.

The profit realized by Tesch und Stabenow from the sale of Zyklon B to the combined Auschwitz Complex was RM4,500 in 1942 and RM5,000 in 1943 (Table III). This was about 1/18th the amount that Wilhelm Pook testified Sehm had told him Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher were making from such sales. In 1942 Tesch und Stabenow made a total net profit of RM 113,000 and the next year RM 143,000. The gross profits from sales of Zyklon B purchased for the Auschwitz camps was less than 4% of the company's yearly net profits. In U.S. dollars at that time, these gross profits represented about $1,000 in 1942 and $1,250 in 1943. Zyklon B sales to Auschwitz were, therefore, hardly a factor in the enrichment of Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher. The Prosecution, as true warriors in "class warfare," [55] alleged that Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher were typically so rapacious that they would do anything for a few more Reichsmarks!

The Defense

In presenting its case, the German Defense could do little more than place the defendants on the witness stand, calling in addi-

tion persons who had known them and their work and having these persons testify under oath as to the characters of Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher. In a situation all too characteristic of the post-World War II United Nations Military Tribunals, it was obvious from the beginning of the proceedings that the burden of proof lay heaviest upon the *Defense*, and that burden was one of disproving beyond a doubt the accusations made frivolously and without restraint by the Prosecution—all this quite contrary to Major Draper's pious declamations (of the defendants being innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt) otherwise. Stirling, the British Judge Advocate at Lueneburg, had already *ruled* that 4½ million Jews had been killed with Zyklon B. Was he now likely to reverse his judgement as a result of any evidence presented in Dr. Tesch's case? By this time, the die was cast! Someone logically had to have recommended the use of the poison and also furnished it for that purpose.

Dr. Tesch admitted his connection with Zyklon B and its commercial development, as a result of his efforts, into a useful, effective fumigant. He discussed its use in fumigation chambers to fumigate clothing and the necessity of simultaneous bathing to kill body lice if people were being deloused [56] to prevent typhus epidemics. In this regard, he pointed out that Gentiles and Jews from the eastern regions were equally afflicted with typhus-carrying lice. He denied vehemently, however, every time he was questioned about it, ever having recommended or known of the use of Zyklon B to purposely kill humans. On the contrary, he emphasized, his efforts had always been, rather, to protect humans and *save* their lives! In spite of all safety precautions, there had been regrettable accidents while using the lethal material, but in no way had there ever been, to his knowledge, intentional killings. If he had learned Zyklon B was being misused to kill people, he would have stopped ordering the material for the offending user immediately.

His firm had contracted to fumigate barracks in several camps. Auschwitz camps were included in these, but the SS on their own responsibility also fumigated barracks. Because of the known size of the Auschwitz complex with its many sub-camps (Table IV) and the known high level of louse infestation in that area, the amount of Zyklon B ordered for Auschwitz through his firm prior to 1944 was not considered excessive. Rather, Auschwitz probably could have used much more Zyklon B in its fumigation operations had it been available, and thus reduced further the many deaths resulting from typhus.[57]

In his cross-examination, the British Military Prosecutor, Major Draper, was obviously more interested in the political implications of the trial rather than in whether Dr. Tesch actually was

guilty of the charge as stated in the indictment. Draper's manner was abusive, and his questions were usually "loaded."

All Draper's questions Dr. Tesch attempted to answer fully. He had joined the NSDAP on 1 May 1933, but was not an active member. His wife was also a Party member. Yes, for RM2.00 per month,[58] he was also a "supporting member" of the SS, but for this he received no favors and might not wear a uniform. He would not agree that the SS was the most ferocious anti-Jewish Party group. No, he did not believe the Jews should be persecuted, but he believed they should leave public life and lead their own lives. No, there had never been persecution of Jews in Germany comparable to that in (Czarist) Russia. He had read inflammatory articles against the Jews and had heard of synagogue burnings, but these acts were openly criticized by most Germans. Goebbels had triggered these excesses, but Hitler had stopped them. He had not heard of the destruction of Jewish property. Draper asked him: "Is it now clear, do you agree with me that your gas helped to exterminate four million people in one concentration camp?" To this rather complex, loaded question, Dr. Tesch answered, according to the translator: "That I did not know; if it was my gas I did not know it."

The translators do not quote Dr. Tesch as saying that Bendel lied, although there are numerous examples during the trial in which Bendel obviously did just that. Rather, Dr. Tesch is placed in the much weaker position of saying that Bendel "passed the truth" and "exaggerated." Because the record is in English, we will never know whether Dr. Tesch could not bring himself to believe that an educated man, such as he considered Bendel to be, would blatantly and glibly lie knowing that he was sending innocent men to their deaths, or whether it was a fluke in the interpreters' choices of words. Might it have been the intent of the translators to leave the impression that as a result of guilt, Dr. Tesch didn't have the nerve to accuse his antagonist of lying?

Dr. Tesch found Broad's testimony much more believable, but pointed out that Broad had not identified the Zyklon B he saw at Auschwitz as having been ordered through Tesch und Stabenow, and that he had revealed that a manufacturer of Zyklon B was located near Auschwitz. As a scientific man accustomed to reason in word and thought, Dr. Tesch pointed out that if humans were ever packed into any space as tightly as Dr. Bendel testified, they would promptly suffocate, making the use of poison gas quite superfluous. He had heard that in Riga, Latvia, a group containing a few Jews had been shot for crimes they had committed in wartime. He could not understand how Dr. Diels could say what he did in his affidavit with no evidence to support his charges. He was unaware that the SS were a law unto them-

selves and not subject to ordinary courts, as Draper avered. Nor had he known that the Gestapo used methods different from ordinary police; he had had no reason to doubt their integrity. He had not heard of four million people going "up the chimney" (as smoke) at Auschwitz.

Yes, he still believed that Zyklon B was used only for fumigation. Responding to this, Draper asked: "Did you feel the SS were more reliable than the Allied [United Nations] authorities, as a matter of information?" Dr. Tesch answered with honesty and great perception (again according to the interpreter): "I cannot say because during the war I did not hear anything else. Today, I think that something might be true but probably there are exaggerations or misunderstandings." Draper replied: "Were you aware that the murder of the four million was partly arranged by the Reicharzt SS?" Dr. Tesch answered: "This is quite news to me. I have never thought of that."

Dr. Tesch then proceeded to say that during his visit to the Sachsenhausen-Oranienburg concentration camp, the inmates in striped suits looked well-fed, healthy and "quite happy." He had heard Hitler say in a speech that a Jewish Zone was being set up in the eastern provinces, and he believed him. Further, he had no reason to believe that Hitler had lied to the Germans. He believed that Hitler and the SS had been perfectly correct in their behavior. He believed Sehm and Bendel to be incorrect in their testimony. Sehm had probably misinterpreted an unimportant remark and invented the remainder; his testimony was "quite impossible." The thought of killing Jews with Zyklon B had never occurred to Dr. Tesch, who believed also that the other witnesses misunderstood something they saw or heard. He did not believe that concentration camps were a natural consequence of the NSDAP but that they were originated to contain persons considered dangerous to the state. Dr. Tesch ended his testimony by saying: "I was not a militant member of the Nazi [sic] Party but I was always loyal to the German State."

With these honest, forthright statements, Dr. Tesch had more or less sealed his own doom and dragged his unfortunate business associate, Herr Weinbacher, into the maelstrom along with him.

Major Draper had failed to prove that either Dr. Tesch or Herr Weinbacher was involved in any alleged plot to kill Jews (or Russians, or anyone else) with Zyklon B or even that the Zyklon B allegedly seen at Auschwitz by Broad had without question been ordered through Tesch und Stabenow. What Draper had done was to produce warm, live bodies to fill roles which had been conjured up deductively and rationalistically to conform to and support the war-time "Holocaust" allegations of Germany's ac-

cusers. One of these was an apparently repentant SS man who, for whatever reasons he might have had, testified under oath [59] that what the United Nations propaganda mills had been screaming about for years was true. That, along with the rabid testimonials at the Lueneburg Bergen-Belsen Tribunal, provided a tale which, if not examined too closely for accuracy and cohesiveness, could be used to calm and reassure those United Nations nationals who had been waiting uneasily for the revelations at war's end which would justify the many self-serving allegations disseminated by propagandists in the prosecution of the war. Many were doubtless fearful of another post-war investigation of such charges, *á la* that which followed World War I, and of what might occur if the people of the United Nations should discover that they had been monstrously deceived a second time by anti-German propagandists.

To the drama created by Broad's testimony, Draper added Dr. Bruno Tesch, cast in the role of a brazen, diabolical, unrepentant, unrehabilitatable "Nazi," a "member" of the "infamous" SS, the developer of the iniquitous Zyklon B, an obvious German heretic and fanatic who, even after seeing the many bloated corpses of Bergen-Belsen, Dachau, etc. in the United Nations-sponsored newspapers, still had the effrontery, the unmitigated gall, even as a prisoner before the United Nations Bar of Justice, to doubt and question the "facts" established; to maintain that from what he knew Nazi racial policy did *not* lead inevitably to concentration camps and gas chambers, that the SS did *not* purposefully kill at least four million Jews at Auschwitz with Zyklon B developed, recommended and provided by him to the concentration camps for that purpose, and so on.

Most certainly, Dr. Tesch could never become a "born-again German" through any of those quasi-religious, mock-baptismal cleansing rites of intellect cartharsis, called "Denazification" or "Reeducation," which Germany's conquerors were yet to decree for Germans who possessed concepts and values contrary to their own.

The British Military Tribunal was confronted with an elementary problem of logic. If, on the basis of the obviously sullied, unclean testimony presented against Dr. Tesch, they acquitted him and Herr Weinbacher, there would have been no one else apparently at hand against whom could be made the accusation of supplying Zyklon B or initially recommending its use to kill Jews. *If, indeed, there was a "Holocaust," SOMEONE had to have carried out these functions.*

With no "Holocaust" to take their place in the columns of the world's newspapers, the many surreptitious, undercover activities, plans and responsibilities of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his

proto-United Nations co-conspirators prior to, during and after the war—today still too-little publicized—would have come under immediate, murderous, and lasting scrutiny. This would have resulted in the United Nations wartime charges and the (still-vulnerable) "integrity" of this organization being ripped asunder in a manner which would have made the revelations about Allied lies found in the World War I Bryce Committee Report on propaganda charges look by comparison like reports on a love feast. If the many plans already formulated diplomatically and formally or informally in war conferences were to be fully, irreversibly implemented as the planners wished, the "New" United Nations organization would have to have the full support of those who might otherwise strongly oppose it. The wartime "atrocity propaganda" charges made by the victors to inflame their soldiers and citizenry, and to justify and condone their own use of progressively more violent, ruthless measures against Germany and Japan, *simply had to be sustained after the war.* There was emphatically to be no "Peace Without Victory" this time, no "Forgive and Forget." And—no "coming clean" about wartime propaganda charges.[60]

C.L. Stirling, who had already functioned as Judge Advocate at the Lueneburg British Military Tribunal regarding the Birkenau SS staff must have pondered his personal position were Dr. Tesch to be freed. *A large number of Germans—some of them women—had already been killed by the British because they had allegedly killed all those people at Auschwitz. Any decision in the Tesch/Weinbacher trial simply had to conform to this fact.* An acquittal would have been most embarrassing, given what had already been "decided" about Auschwitz—and already done (executions) about it. Stirling was doubtless chosen for both his offices —as were the others—on the basis of his dedication and adaptability to the goals and the great "New" postwar world envisioned by the founding fathers of the United Nations, the *Illuminati* of the impending Utopian Millenium! Any doubts or stirrings of conscience cannot, therefore, have posed a problem insurmountable to Stirling. The loss of Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher, even if innocent, would be no loss at all to the "New Germany" in the "New World Order" envisioned by the United Nations.

Verdict, Sentence, Execution

The verdict was short. Both Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher were declared "Guilty." Dr. Drosihn was acquitted. The Tribunal's sentence: Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher must hang! Another British Military Tribunal (there were to be 216 such tribunals) had cut a swath through Germans.

There were still attempts to avoid execution of the sentence. Both condemned men protested their innocence in appeals to the Commander of the 8th Corps District of the British Army of the Rhine. Briefs from their defense attorneys were attached outlining and documenting more fully the unreliable character of the testimonies of Sehm, Broad, Bendel, and the others. The appeals were denied. A subsequent appeal for a pardon for both men was made by the employees of Tesch und Stabenow, and yet another for a pardon for Herr Weinbacher was made by his stepsister. These appeals were similarly refused.

On 26 April 1946, Montgomery of Alamein, Commander-in-Chief, BAOR, issued death warrants to the Director or Officer-in-Charge of the Hamburg Prison to execute Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher within 24 hours after receipt of the writ. Both warrants were executed at 11:23 AM on 16 May 1946, at Hameln Zuchthaus (prison). Dr. Bruno Tesch and Herr Karl Weinbacher were dead.

Both these honorable, innocent men died, probably aghast that such a monster masquerading as "Justice," which had previously raged east of the Bug River, now stalked purposefully with unchecked violence east of the Maas River.

For Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher, the ordeal was ended. But for those Germans still alive out of what had been a Nation of 80 million[61] before the war, it had barely begun. An ordeal of far greater magnitude was about to be unleashed upon them with deadly, methodical, Cromwellian-puritan efficiency and fury, with the "Holocaust" tales associated with Zyklon B and, principally, the Auschwitz camp, cited over and over again—to this day—as the ostensible "moral" justification. The trial of Dr. Bruno Tesch and his associates was of no small importance to the firm establishment of these tales. We have seen how that trial was conducted, and on what bases it reached its conclusions. From this some conclusions of our own about how to approach and examine one of the most astounding and *incredible* collections of tales in not only recent, but all, history, must naturally follow.

Table I

Zyklon B Users Ordering Through Tesch und Stabenow*

I. German Government Users (Before 1944)
   A. Concentration Camps
      1. Auschwitz Complex
      2. Gross Rosen
      3. Majdanek-Lublin
      4. Neuengamme-Hamburg
      5. Ravensbrueck
      6. Sachsenhausen-Oranienburg
   B. Wehrmacht Hauptsanitaetspark, Berlin
   C. SS Voransalon** (Including Waffen SS)
II. German Non-Government, Non-Military Users
   A. Disinfection Institute of City of Guthafen
   B. German Hygiene Institute, Riga
   C. City Police, Stettin
   D. Burgomeister's Office, Danzig
   E. German Railway Repair Works, Posen
III. Foreign Users
   A. Finnish Army, Helsinki
   B. Norsk Fumigating Company, Oslo

* This list in not intended to be a comprehensive list of all Zyklon B users who had their orders processed by Tesch und Stabenow. Rather, the institutions given are those specifically mentioned in the trial transcript.

** Main SS (possibly Purchasing) Office

Table II

Quantities of Zyklon B Ordered Through or by Tesch und Stabenow for Various Users in 1942 and 1943*

	1942	1943	Incremental Increase 1942-43
Total Zyklon B Ordered Through or by Tesch und Stabenow (kg.)	79,069.9	119,458.4	151%
Total Zyklon B Ordered for All German Government Users (kg.)	20,363.6	38,284.9	188%
Percentage Represented of Total Tesch und Stabenow Orders	25.75%	32.05%	
Total Zyklon B Ordered for Wehrmacht Hauptsanitaetspark, Berlin (kg.)	11,232.0	19,982.0	178%
Percentage Represented of Total Tesch und Stabenow Orders	14.21%	16.73%	
Total Zyklon B Ordered for ALL Concentration Camps (kg.)	9,131.6	18,302.9	200%
Percentage Represented of Total Tesch und Stabenow Orders	11.55%	15.32%	
Total Zyklon B Ordered for AUSCHWITZ CAMPS (kg.)	7,500	12,000	160%
Percentage Represented of Total Tesch und Stabenow Orders	9.48%	10.05%	
Total Zyklon B Ordered for Other (Non-German) Users			
Finnish Army, Helsinki, Finland (kg.)	7,052.5	10,000	142%
Norsk Fumigating Company, Oslo, Norway (kg.)	5,794.8	12,004	207%

* After December, 1943, all German Government users of Zyklon B obtained their supplies from the Wehrmacht Hauptsanitaetspark, Berlin.

Table III

Tesch und Stabenow Profits for Years 1942 and 1943
and Their Dependence Upon Zyklon B Orders*
(All Figures in Reichsmarks)

1942	Tesch und Stabenow	1943
113,000	Total Net Profit	143,000
425,000	Total Value Of Zyklon B Ordered By or Through Tesch und Stabenow	396,000
92,000	Total Gross Profit From Zyklon B Ordered by or Through Tesch und Stabenow	127,000
12,096	Total Gross Profit From Processing Orders for Zyklon B for Government Users	12,900**
5,424	Total Gross Profits From Processing Orders for Zyklon B for All Camps	6,167**
4,500 (4%)***	Total Gross Profits From Orders Processed By Tesch und Stabenow for the Auschwitz Camps	5,000 (3.5%)***

After 31 December 1943, all German Government users of Zyklon B were supplied by the Wehrmacht Hauptsanitaetspark, Berlin.

* The tally sheets used in the trial which were prepared by Alfred Zaun, Chief Bookkeeper for Tesch und Stabenow, were lost along with the other Exhibits used in the trial proceedings. The above chart is a reconstruction from data given in the trial transcript. In some cases, where indicated, the values are prorated.

**These values were calculated by using 10% of the gross value for the first five months of 1943 and 2½% thereafter. These fees were set by the German Government.

***The values in parentheses for the Auschwitz Camps represent the percentage of the total Tesch und Stabenow net profit. The Auschwitz profit is actually a gross value from which overhead, freight, etc. must still be deducted to obtain the true profit. The true per cent net profit is therefore even smaller than the percentage given in parentheses!

Table IV

The Camps Associated With the Auschwitz Complex*

Auschwitz I—Auschwitz-Zasole (The "Stammlager"—Original Camp, Headquarters for the entire complex)
Auschwitz II—Auschwitz-Birkenau ("Birkenau")
Auschwitz III—Auschwitz-Buna ("Monowitz" [I.G. Farbenindustrie])

Babice	Ledziny-Lawki
Blachowinia Slaska	Libiaz Maly
Brobek	Lagiewniki
Budy	Lagisza Cmentarna
Bruenn (Czechoslovakia)	Plawy
Chelmek	Prudnik
Chorzow	Rajsko
Czechowice-Dziedzice	Rydultowy
Czernia	Rybnik
Gleiwitz (4 Camps)	Siemianowice
Goleszow	Sosnowiec
Hajduki	Stara Kuznia
Harmenze	Swietochlowice
Huta Ksiazeca	Trachy
Jawoszpwoce	Trzebinia
Jawornzno	Trzebionka
Kobior	Zabrze

*Taken from Datner, et. al., *Genocide*, Warsaw, 1962, p. 96. Auschwitz-Zasole remained the Administrative Headquarters of the entire system until November 1943 (NO-021), when the entire administrative system was reorganized on orders from Reichsfuehrer-SS Heinrich Himmler. The Auschwitz Complex, like its smaller counter-parts Buchenwald, Dachau, Mauthausen, etc., and their sub-camps, reported to SS Headquarters in Oranienburg.

Notes

1. Robert H. Jackson, United States; I. Nikitchenko and A. Trainin, USSR; Viscount (William Allen) Jowitt, United Kingdom; Robert Falco, France. *Trial of the Major War Criminals* (hereafter cited as TMWC), Vol. 1, p. 8.
2. The "Durchgangslager" (transit camp) Bergen-Belsen was a camp primarily for Jews destined to leave Europe, usually via Spain. Here, the dead were primarily Jewish. In other camps, the dead were overwhelmingly Polish.
3. See statements by Lord Justice Sir Geoffrey Lawrence, TMWC, Vol. IX, pp. 33-34.
4. In view of the recent happenings involving Dr. Wilhelm Staeglich, who because of his authorship of the book *Der Auschwitz Mythos: Legende oder Wirklichkeit?* (Tuebingen: Grabert Verlag, 1979) suffered the "withdrawl" or "revocation" by the Georg-August University in Goettingen of the doctoral title awarded him there in 1951 (presumably for academic excellence), it is of interest to observe that Dr. Kolb—who was awarded his title (Dr. phil.) in 1959—has apparently done quite well since 1960 as "Assistent am Historischen Seminar der Universitaet Goettingen" by hawking the version of history deemed "kosher" by the occupation authorities. For years, some have looked derisively upon the social studies as disciplines being no more than exercises in remembering and "regurgitating" dogma solemnly pronounced in lecture. Without the active questioning, searching and testing provided by the historical revisionists, it is difficult to see how the study of history could be much more!
5. New York *Times*, 22 April 1945, p. 12.
6. It is the detailed study of the individual mental gymnastics of these witnesses in the various cases, each struggling to save his own life with stories of his own invention, mingled with just enough truth to deceive the unwary, striving to support the thesis of the Prosecution and yet leave himself guiltless, which has been most fruitful for the historical revisionist. With concentrated, in-depth study, the "Holocaust" accusations become a tangled mass of conflicting, even self-refuting charges, clearly tailored at the time to support the general charges preordained and demanded by the United Nations prosecutors.
7. Besides being very destructive to foods and other goods, vermin and insects are dangerous carriers of diseases harmful to humans.
8. As wartime shortages grew more acute, the lachrymator or "warning agent" was omitted, this change and the attendant danger being duly noted on the billing and on the can label.
9. Because of its deadliness, Zyklon B was always sold in sheet steel cans which had been soldered shut at the factory. They were opened by placing a special circular cutter on the can and hitting it once sharply with a hammer. Once the can-top was cut out in this manner, all the material contained in the can was to be used. The

can could *not* be resealed. Zyklon B was sold and priced according to the amount (by weight) of hydrogen cyanide contained in the can (RM5.00/kg.), and this weight was always printed clearly on the label. The can sizes in Germany were: 100g., 200g., 500g., 1,000g., and 1,500g.—the weights referring to *contained hydrogen cyanide*. The corresponding total can weights were about three times these given weights because of the weight of the absorbant material and the can itself.

The fatal dosage of hydrogen cyanide for a normal-sized man varies, but Puntigam, Breymesser and Bernfus (*Blausaeuregas-kammern zur Fleckfieberabwehr*, p. 200), give this dosage as about 70 milligrams.

A hydrogen cyanide concentration of 50 parts per million (0.005%) in air is considered dangerous to human life. At 200ppm. (0.02%), loss of consciousness may be rapid, following by death if medical treatment is not promptly administered.

At higher concentrations, hydrogen cyanide forms explosive mixtures with air. The explosive range is from 6-41% (vol.) of hydrogen cyanide in air.

There was also a "Zyklon A." Chemically, it was methyl cyanoformate. It also was highly toxic and was a good fumigating agent, but since it was potentially useful as a war gas and as a chemical intermediate for war gases, Germany was forbidden by the Treaty of Versailles to manufacture it. It could have anyway, but didn't.

10. Hydrogen cyanide gas was used by the German Army in World War I for fumigation before Zyklon B was developed.
11. Other fumigating gases used by Tesch und Stabenow were "Tritox" (trichloroacetonitrile), "T-Gas" (a mixture of ethylene oxide and carbon dioxide), and "Original Gas" (a mixture of methal and ether).
12. Where large quantities of hydrogen cyanide (Zyklon B gas) were regularly required, they were most often generated at the site by reacting sulfuric acid with sodium cyanide. Hydrogen cyanide made in this manner was much cheaper than the RM5.00 per kilogram paid for it as Zyklon B.
13. In the United States, one hydrogen cyanide supplier for fumigating firms was the American Cyanamid and Chemical Corporation. See their *Military Fumigation Manual*, 1944. For other uses of Zyklon B for fumigation in the U.S., see U.S. Public Health Service, *Public Health Reports*, Vol. 46, No. 27 (3 July 1931), pp. 1572-1578, and No. 38 (10 July 1931), pp. 1633-1636.
14. Because of a patent dispute, relations between the DEGESCH and Tesch und Stabenow were not cordial. This dispute resulted among other things in Tesch und Stabenow's insisting on its own special label on all cans of Zyklon B ordered through them after 1942.
15. Dr. Gerhard Peter's decision was final. After the war he was arrested on charges similar to those brought against Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher. He was released from United Nations custody after serving a total of about five years in prison including time awaiting trial. (Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution* [London: Val-

lentine, Mitchell, 1968], p. 148.) As of 1983, the DEGESCH was still doing business in Germany and internationally.

16. The use of hydrogen cyanide for fumigation represented a heavy penalty the Germans had to pay in the forfeiture of production of other chemicals they needed desperately. One kilogram of hydrogen cyanide could be converted into 3.7kg. of methyl methacrylate or 1.96kg. of acrylonitrile. Both chemicals were and still are essential ingredients in the plastics industry. Acrylonitrile was in addition a component of Buna N synthetic rubber which the Germans could never produce in sufficient quantity.

Hydrogen cyanide remains to this day an almost indispensable "heavy" chemical. Most of it is "captive" production used in "on-site" industrial synthesis. A single plant may make enough hydrogen cyanide in a 24-hour period every day which, if properly distributed, would kill the entire population of the United States!

The use of highly toxic chemicals in heavy industry is nothing new, nor is it alarming. In addition to hydrogen cyanide, large quantities of phosgene are made for use in the plastics industry and large quantities of liquid hydrogen fluoride are used in the refining industry. The extent of production of carbon monoxide each day in the United States by all sources in which it is an intermediate chemical reactant confounds the imagination.

17. British Army Number 328165.
18. Dr. Joachim Drosihn was a zoologist employed by Tesch und Stabenow.
19. This mastery, an unstated goal of American international adventurers and their allies, had not been accomplished in 1918, as a result of an embarassing number of fateful circumstances. As advantageous as the "idealistic" Wilsonian "Fourteen Points" might have been to achieving an Allied propaganda victory, they were still an abomination, an albatross around the necks of the victors at the end of the war when they were eager to divide the spoils. Their general and open refusal to adhere to these stated principles—also the sheer bloodiness of the conflict just ended—led to early disillusionment and resulted in an unexpectedly short re-education/occupation/"reconstruction" period.

As a means to insure that this situation would not be repeated in World War II, the Roosevelt-Churchill propaganda instrument finally and finely called the "Atlantic Charter" was published. Objectively appraised, the "Atlantic Charter" was a minor public relations issue of the Argentia (Newfoundland) conference. The conference itself was really the first of a number of United Nations war conferences. It was unique only from the standpoint that the United States at the time was *officially* (though not actually) a "Neutral."

20. This did not invariably work to the advantage of the United Nations prosecutors. As it became apparent (from statements such as that of Robert H. Jackson—see p. 270) that they were expected to become parties to a monstrous legal atrocity and historical fraud, they sometimes—even at the cost of placing themselves in jeopardy—fought with the "strength of ten" against verdicts they knew to

be unjust, preordained, and inevitable. "Anti-NSDAP" though they might have been, they could nevertheless easily recognize injustice in the form of a legalized lynching, and would fight it to the bitter end! Little wonder that in Berlin in 1945-46, many who had opposed Hitler but had finally seen the form German "reconstruction" by the United Nations was to take, said privately: "Herr Gott schenk' uns das Fuenfte Reich. Das Vierte ist dem Dritten Gleich!" (Lord God give us the Fifth Reich. The Fourth is unto the Third like!)

21. TMWC, Vol. III, p. 551.
22. The later testimony of Alfred Zaun, Tesch und Stabenow's chief bookkeeper, showed this statement to be completely false. (See pp. 282-83.)
23. Full name: Bernhard Detlev Friedrich Carl Frahm.
24. Vermin is properly translated into German as *das Ungeziefer* (preferred), *die Brut*, *das Gesindel*, or *das Geschmeiss*.
25. Tesch und Stabenow furnished heating elements to vaporize Zyklon B gas, and pipes for the circulation system, both for use in standard fumigation chambers. (See note 30.)
26. TMWC, Vol. III, p. 551.
27. German Federal Archives (*Bundesarkiv*), Koblenz, West Germany.
28. In his appeal attempting to save Herr Weinbacher's life, Dr. Stumme showed that on the basis of testimony given during the trial, 1,000kg. of Zyklon B gas would have been necessary to fumigate 200,000 uniforms *once*!
29. The larger can sizes (see note 9) were intended for larger fumigation chambers or for the fumigation of barracks.
30. The developement of the Zyklon B fumigation chamber spanned the two World Wars, and depended almost entirely upon the danger of epidemics from lice-carried spotted typhus. These chambers were therefore known and referred to as "hydrogen cyanide delousing chambers" ("Blausaeure-Entlausungs-kammer"). Faced with the absolute necessity of such chambers and a lethal fumigating agent (always in short supply) in wartime, the DEGESCH delousing chamber was designed. It provided for the safe introduction of the sealed Zyklon B can of the required size for the volume of the fumigating chamber. The entry port was sealed airtight and the can opened by an externally-operated screw which pierced the soldered can inside the sealed chamber, allowing the Zyklon B granules to fall onto a heated surface (the "Vergasergeraet" ["Gasifier"] or "stove," in the jargon of the "Holocaust" disciples), assuring the evaporation of the liquid hydrogen cyanide from the granules. A circulatory fan circulated the air / Zyklon B mixture within the chamber to mix the gases. This prevented gas stratification, since Zyklon B gas is *lighter* than air (not heavier, as so often erroneously stated or implied by the "Holocaust" propagandists), and made certain that the required mixture of 20g. of Zyklon B per cubic meter of air penetrated throughout the entire fumigation chamber, including the clothing articles to be deloused. With the circulation fan, the fumigation could be completed in one hour. Without such a system, the entire procedure required at least 16 hours—preferably 24 hours. After fumigation, the circulation sys-

tem exhausted the poisonous mixture up a stack and aired the fumigated clothing before the airtight doors to the chamber were opened and the deloused, fumigated clothing removed to be reclaimed by its owners.

The advantages of such chambers were obvious and substantial. By the Summer of 1943, 552 Zyklon B fumigation or delousing chambers with circulation systems had been constructed at 226 different sites. One hundred more had been constructed without circulation systems and were being used despite the longer fumigation time. Almost half these delousing chambers were constructed between January 1942 and April 1943. The munitions industry had 249 such chambers either in regular operation or under construction, since in the Summer of 1943 it became obligatory to inspect foreign workers regularly for the duration of the war to insure that they were and remained free from vermin. (Emil Wuestinger, "Vermehrter Einsatz von Blausaeure-Entlausungskammern," ["Increased Usage of Hydrogen Cyanide Delousing Chambers"], *Gesundheits-Ingenieur*, Jahrgang 67, Heft 7, pp. 179-80.)

31. Tesch und Stabenow began using its own distinctive labels on Zyklon B ordered through its offices in 1942.
32. WO 235/165, Case 145, Vols. I-VII, January-March 1946.
33. Bernd Naumann, *Auschwitz* (New York: Praeger, 1966), pp. 162-82.
34. The existing crematory at Auschwitz-Zasole has three ventilators (ventilator openings) on top—one of which was allegedly used in the killing operation. All ventilators are square, about 8" long on a side. This crematory is the result of the addition of a second furnace containing two muffles (two cremation positions) to the "Old Crematorium," giving a total of four cremation positions (four muffles) at this site.
35. The numbering system for the crematories at the Auschwitz complex can cause confusion. In the German usage, crematory I was at Auschwitz-Zasole. Crematories II and III were at Auschwitz-Birkenau, as were the buildings referred to in the "Holocaust" literature as crematories IV and V, but by the Germans as "Badeanstalt(en) fuer Sonderaktion." This paper refers to crematories II and III (at Birkenau—German usage) as Nos. I and II, respectively.
36. This concept is one of several which must be true without question if the "Holocaust" intent of the Germans and the figures of 4-4½ million Jews allegedly killed at Auschwitz-Birkenau is to be accepted as credible. After what is presumed to have been a detailed search, the Auschwitz Museum revealed (cf. Danuta Czech, *Hefte Aus Auschwitz*) in 1959-1964 that only 202,499 inmate numbers were given out at Auschwitz. Number 202,499 was given to a German habitual criminal from Mauthausen only ten days before the camp was captured by the Russians.

The International Red Cross, in published data which, on the basis of United Nations allegations, is admitted by them to be grossly incomplete because data from numerous satellite camps is missing, lists 50,923 persons dead in Auschwitz-Zasole, Auschwitz-Birkenau and Auschwitz-Buna (Monowitz). The first two camps are sup-

posed to have been the "murder camps." Their data is based upon the "Totenbuch" which the Germans themselves kept in each camp. This "incomplete" data represents those records kept by the Germans of inmates who died of any and all causes in the three main Auschwitz camps. (A. de Cocatrix [Director of the International Tracing Service, Arolsen, Germany], "The Number of Victims of the National Socialist Persecution" [see bibliography].)

37. Reitlinger says (p. 150) that the first crematory built at Auschwitz-Birkenau (No. I) began service on 13 March 1943, and as late as 13 June 1943 it was still the only one operational. Up to this time, the crematory at Auschwitz-Zasole was used. I have found no German document which indicates that crematory II at Birkenau ever became functional. On the other hand, many documents exist which deal with the construction and operation of crematory I at Birkenau. The alleged dates of service above are "estimated" by "Holocaust" historians.
38. Exhibit 2 in the trial (picture missing).
39. A concentration camp formerly in the Mauthausen system.
40. Naumann, pp. xi-xxx.
41. Some may say that Perry Broad had not played honorably, but it must be said of him that he had correctly assessed the nature of the deadly game being played with him and the others, and by his adept—albeit deceitful—playing with his tormentors, he won his life from them while many others in being honest had lost theirs. In 1945 in conquered, occupied Germany, that in many persons' minds was all that still mattered!
42. See note 35.
43. Perry Broad's testimony (pp. 277-78) indicates a much greater frequency of barrack fumigation with Zyklon B.
44. Dr. Bendel's value of the lethal dosage of 1,000g. per 500 people (2g. per person) conflicts sharply with the value given in the literature: 70 mg. per person, which is 0.07g. per person (see note 9). Any reasonable killing procedure might have been expected to contain a "safety factor" of perhaps five times the estimated lethal dosage—but hardly a factor *28 times* greater than necessary!
45. Although flesh can rapidly be converted by fire into unrecognizable ash, bone *cannot*. Even the alleged grinding up of these bones would leave microscopic residue recognizable as bone, if not human bone. The one small ball mill ordered by SS Standartenfuehrer Blobel from Schriever & Co. in 1942 (NO 4467) could hardly have dealt with the multitude of corpses alleged to have been incinerated in the crematories, much less those allegedly cremated in open trenches (supposedly "disappearing" in the flames). Had the pond at Birkenau been used as alleged (the disposal site for human ashes) it would be today a *mound* containing many millions of pieces of calcined bone still recognizable as human bone! If the Vistula had been so used, its bed would have been strewn with telltale pieces of burnt bone all the way to Warsaw, if not Danzig!
46. All official German reference to these buildings identified them as "Badeanstalt(en) fuer Sonderaktion"—bathhouse(s) for special action (or special purpose).

47. The original German plans described these rooms, one each for crematories I and II, as "Leichenkeller"—mortuaries for corpses awaiting cremation. Work by Dr. Robert Faurisson supports this description completely.
48. Both Bendel and Broad alleged that in the killing procedure, two one-kilogram cans of Zyklon B were used in each chamber. One may note with some interest that the Zyklon B purchase orders from the DEGESCH for the Oranienburg (Sachsenhausen) and Auschwitz camps, dated from February to April 1944 and allegedly surrendered by Kurt Gerstein at his capture by United Nations troops, dealt exclusively with 500g. cans. In case of shortages, of course, two 500g. cans would replace a 1kg. can, but it appears that *only* the 500g. cans were shipped, indicating that the need was for the smaller can. The question obviously arises: What use was there for a 500g. can of Zyklon B at the Auschwitz and Sachsenhausen-Oranienburg disinfection and decontagion stations ("Entwesung und Entseuchung Station")? The standard fumigation chamber was 10 cubic meters in volume and required only a 200g. can of Zyklon B to obtain the required concentration of 20g. Zyklon B gas per cubic meter of air. Consequently, one is led to believe that both these sites and/or their sub-camps had fumigation chambers with some 25 cubic meters of volume. Where were they located? A good bet might be the "Sauna" (closed to the public now) at Birkenau for new arrivals, and the buildings designated by the Germans as "Badeanstalt(en) fuer Sonderaktion" (now completely destroyed), also at Birkenau, which probably functioned as the recurrent delousing stations for the personnel permanently interned there.
49. In examining the entire testimony given by Dr. Bendel, I could not help but notice the extreme similarity of parts of it with the alleged experiences of the legendary Dr. Miklos Nyszli. (For an interesting discussion of Nyszli, see Paul Rassinier, *Debunking the Genocide Myth* [Torrance, Calif.: Noontide Press, 1978], pp. 244-50.)
50. From 30 August 1944, when W.H. Lawrence described in the New York *Times* (pp. 1,9) the "River Rouge" killing installation at the Lublin, Poland, Majdanek camp which was "almost identical with those pictured in American motion pictures," the preferred Allied propaganda line as to the method of killing had been that it was the introduction of hydrogen cyanide gas from cylinders through pipes into the chambers disguised as baths. Dr. Bimko sought to give support to this allegation and was successful at the British Lueneburg Tribunal. At Dr. Tesch's trial, it became obvious that the claim of this method had to be abandoned, since Zyklon B was a solid and would not flow through pipes! Also, it was stored in relatively small cans and not in gas cylinders. Hydrogen cyanide is a liquid at room temperature and vaporizes only slowly unless heated. (See note 30.)

    Professor Karl Schwartz testified that so far as he knew, liquid hydrogen cyanide in cylinders was available only in the United States. At this time, the Germans still made all their hydrogen cyanide, an essential chemical intermediate, by reacting sodium

cyanide with sulfuric acid. (See note 16.) This was done at the location where and as it was needed. One is tempted to wonder about the nationality of Dr. Bimko's interrogators and also about the story by Kurt Gerstein regarding the cylinders of hydrogen cyanide he buried in Poland rather than deliver to Majdanek for alleged killing experiments.

After the trial of Dr. Tesch and Herr Weinbacher, the story that Zyklon B gas (hydrogen cyanide) was administered from a compressed gas cylinder through pipes into and out of a showerhead to kill people was allowed to die of neglect!

51. At the time of Dr. Bimko's testimony, it was stoutly maintained by Germany's accusers that the shower at Dachau was a "gas chamber" used to kill thousands of Jews. Subsequent investigation of this installation—visible to this day—has proved beyond the slightest doubt that it was what the Germans had said all along—a shower bath! (It is not today claimed even by "Holocaust" historians that people were gassed at Dachau.) This shower is similar in design to those types of rooms recommended by Puntigam, et al., for delousing operations.

    With such findings, Dachau's wartime and immediate postwar reputation as the worst camp of all was no longer viable for use by the United Nations propagandists, and their eyes of necessity turned eastward.
52. The Wehrmacht maintained a literal "cordon sanitaire" in Poland to protect its troops against typhus. Personnel crossing this line east to west were required to bath and be examined while their clothing was being fumigated with Zyklon B gas if it was available. This decontamination precedure was essentially the same as that used for camp inmates.
53. 70mg. (0.07g.) of Zyklon B gas per average-sized human. (See note 9.)
54. See note 30.
55. In this tribunal as at Nuremberg, there were frequent references to the rapaciousness of German capitalists and the evil resulting from their devotion to the profit motive. (The implication seemed to have been that even American capitalists were similarly devoted!) One is left with the feeling that these gentlemen of the prosecution were as certain in their own minds that the profit incentive in capitalism leads as inevitably to human exploitation and acts such as selling Zyklon B to kill Jews as they were that National Socialism led inevitably to concentration camps and gas chambers!
56. Puntigam and Pichler, "Raumloesung von Entlausungsanlagen," *Gesundheits-Ingenieur*, Jahrgang 67, Heft 6 (Juni 1944), p. 139.
57. See note 16. One is tempted to believe that if the Germans had intended to kill any large group of people by poisoning them, they would not have chosen to use so valuable a chemical intermediate as hydrogen cyanide. Much more virulent poisons were and are available, some much cheaper, and none requiring rather cumbersome gas chambers and other apparati for administration to the intended victims.
58. Dr. Tesch explained that this relatively small sum (about 50 cents

in U.S. equivalent at the time) was essentially a welfare donation.

59. But later at the Frankfurt "Auschwitz Trial," he denounced and disavowed large portions of this testimony. See p. 279.
60. See Friedrich Grimm, *Politische Justize: Die Krankheit unserer Zeit* (Bonn: Bonner Universitaets-Buchdruckerei, gebr. Scheur Gmbh., 1953), pp. 146-48. The interviewer mentioned in this passage was none other than British "black" propagandist Sefton Delmer, masquerading as a "university professor."
61. A rough review of certain native populations in 1914, 1939, and 1960, a quick glance at the present map of the world and a knowledge of the destruction visited upon certain nations, their populations, cities, universities, churches—their whole cultural life—all which were to be rebuilt as nearly as possible in the images of, and at the pleasure of, their conquerors, will give the best insight as to where and against whom were visited the true twentieth-century "holocausts"—and who was responsible for them.

Bibliography

I. Documents

Cocatrix, A. de. "The Number of Victims of the National Socialist Persecution: Exposé presented on the Occasion of the International Conference of the Comite International des Camps, 22-25 April 1977." Arolsen International Tracing Service, International Red Cross.

Nuremberg War Crimes Documents:

NO-021
NO-4467
1553-PS

British Public Record Office, Judge Advocate General's Office. War of 1939-45: War Crimes Papers (WO 235).

WO 235-12, Case 12, Bergen-Belsen and Auschwitz Concentration Camps Case (Lueneburg Tribunal), 11 vols.

WO 235-83, Case 71, Bruno Tesch, Karl Weinbacher, & Joachim Drosihn (Hamburg Tribunal).

II. Books

American Cyanamid and Chemical Corporation. *Military Fumigation Manual: Zyklon Discoids for Insect Control.* 1944.

Datner, et. al. *Genocide.* Warsaw: 1962.

International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg. *Trial of the Major War Criminals.* (*TMWC*), Vols. I, III & IX.

Kolb, Eberhard. *Bergen-Belsen: Geschichte des "Aufenthaltslagers" 1943-1945.* Hannover: Verlag fuer Literatur und Zeitgeschehen, GmbH., 1962.

Naumann, Bernd. [Translation by Jean Steinberg.] *Auschwitz.* New York: Praeger, 1966.

Puntigam, Franz; Breymesser, Hermann; and Erich Bernfus. *Blausaeuregaskammern zur Fleckfieberabwehr*. Berlin: Sonderveroeffentlichung des Reichsarbeitsblattes, Reichsarbeitsministerium, 1943.

Reitlinger, Gerald. *The Final Solution: The Attempt To Exterminate The Jews Of Europe, 1939-1945*. New York: A.S. Barnes & Co., 1961.

III. Periodicals and Newspapers

Czech, Danuta. "Kalendarium Der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau." *Hefte Aus Auschwitz*, [Issued by the State Museum at Auschwitz, Poland], 1962.

"Kremer's Fate Is Main Topic—'How Will You Kill Kremer?' " *New York Times*. 22 April 1945, p. 12.

Lawrence, W.H. "Nazi Mass Killings Laid Bare In (Majdanek) Camp." *New York Times*. 30 August 1944, pp. 1, 9.

Puntigam, F. und Pichler, H. "Raumloesung von Enlausungsanlagen." *Gesundheits-Ingenieur*. Jahrgang 67, Juni 1944, Heft 6, p. 139.

U.S. Public Health Service. "Public Health Reports." Vol. 46, No. 27 (July 3, 1931), pp. 1572-1578; No. 38 (July 10, 1931), pp. 1633-1636.

Wuestinger, Emil. "Vermehrter Einsatz von Blausaeure-Entlausungskammern." *Gesundheits-Ingenieur*. Jahrgang 67, 1944, Heft 7, pp. 179-180.

Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz: Last President of a United Germany

HIS SUCCESSION, HIS GOVERNMENT, THE NUREMBERG PROCEEDINGS, THE AFTERMATH— SOME PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS AND EXPERIENCES

H. KEITH THOMPSON

On the afternoon of 30 April 1945, with Berlin engulfed in flames and besieged by the Russians, the Hero of the Second World War [1] took his own life in his cement bunker beneath the chancellery complex. This courageous act, perhaps the ultimate act of courage, represented the termination of the heroic last stand of Western Civilization, a civilization and culture nurtured and developed in Europe for many prior centuries. The tragic death of this last natural leader of Europe represented a military-political victory for the forces of Asiatic Communism and Russian Nationalism on the one hand, and Jewish Bolshevism (as exemplified by the United States, England, France and their multitude of last-minute vassals and hangers-on) on the other. The so-called "victors" of World War II were already at each other's throats, and would enter into a politico-military struggle, beginning in 1945, and continuing unabated even today. But at that moment in April of 1945, the so-called Allies, jubilant in their economic-military victory, were not much concerned with the future and made their first political error in failing to be magnanimous towards the defeated Axis powers. The fruitless and self-defeating spirit of Hebraic revenge would motivate their every action in the days and years ahead, a spirit so effectively demonstrated in the doctrine of "unconditional surrender," which cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of citizens and soldiers, Axis and Allied as well.

For a few brief weeks during late April and May of 1945, another leader of Europe came to power, an honorable man, respected even within the military councils of the Allies. That man was Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz, commander-in-chief of the German Navy, in overall command of German military forces in the north, and at that tense moment engaged in arranging sea and other transportation for the masses of refugees fleeing from the eastern areas.[2] To his overwhelming astonishment, Doenitz had been designated by Hitler as his successor and head of state. In his last political testament executed at 4:00 a.m. on 29 April 1945, and witnessed by Dr. Joseph Goebbels, *Reichsleiter* Martin Bormann, and Generals Wilhelm Burgdorf and Hans Krebs, Adolf Hitler appointed Grand Admiral Doenitz as "President of the Reich and Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces . . . by virtue of my statement in the *Reichstag* on September 1st, 1939 . . ."[3] To capture the spirit of Hitler's political testament, I cite the following excerpts:

> . . . I die with a happy heart, aware of the immeasurable deeds and achievements of our soldiers at the front, our women at home, the achievements of our farmers and workers and the work, unique in history, of our youth who bear my name. . . . From the sacrifice of our soldiers and from my own unity with them unto death, will in any case spring up in the history of Germany, the seed of a radiant renaissance of the National Socialist movement and thus of the realization of a true community of nations. . . . I beg the heads of the Armies, the Navy and the Air Force to strengthen by all possible means the spirit of resistance of our soldiers in the National Socialist sense . . . our task, that of continuing the building of a National Socialist State, represents the work of the coming centuries, which places every single person under an obligation always to serve the common interest and to subordinate his own advantage to this end. I demand of all Germans, all National Socialists, men, women and all the men of the Armed Forces, that they be faithful and obedient unto death to the new government and its President . . .[4]

At Ploen on the evening of 30 April 1945, Doenitz received only the following message: "The *Fuehrer* has appointed you, Herr Admiral, as his successor in place of *Reichsmarschall* Goering. Confirmation in writing follows. You are hereby authorized to take any measures which the situation demands.—Bormann."[5] In his *Memoirs*, Doenitz describes his reactions:

> . . . This took me completely by surprise. Since July 20, 1944, I had not spoken to Hitler at all except at some large gathering. . . . I had never received any hint on the subject from anyone else. . . . I assumed that Hitler had nominated me because he wished to clear the way to enable an officer of the Armed Forces to put an end to

> the war. That this assumption was incorrect I did not find out until the winter of 1945-46 in Nuremberg, when for the first time I heard the provisions of Hitler's will. . . . When I read the signal I did not for a moment doubt that it was my duty to accept the task . . . it had been my constant fear that the absence of any central authority would lead to chaos and the senseless and purposeless sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of lives . . . I realized . . . that the darkest moment in any fighting man's life, the moment when he must surrender unconditionally, was at hand. I realized, too, that my name would remain forever associated with the act and that hatred and distortion of facts would continue to try and besmirch my honor. But duty demanded that I pay no attention to any such considerations. My policy was simple—to try and save as many lives as I could . . .[6]

Doenitz moved forcefully. He met with Heinrich Himmler at Ploen and politely declined Himmler's offer to become the "second man" in the Doenitz government. Doenitz ordered Field Marshal Keitel and General Jodl to come to Ploen so that the military situation could be assessed.[7]

On the morning of 1 May, Doenitz received the following radio message, classified "Secret and Personal," from Bormann at the chancellery: "Will now in force. Coming to you as quickly as possible. Pending my arrival you should in my opinion refrain from public statement."[8] Doenitz was left to presume from the text that Hitler was dead but he knew none of the circumstances. Some public position had to be taken and immediately. He relates in his *Memoirs* that he felt that the announcement of Hitler's death should be couched in respectful terms: ". . . To denigrate him . . . as, I felt, many around me would have liked me to do, would, in my opinion, have been a mean and cheap thing to do . . . I believed that decency demanded that I should word my announcement in the manner in which it was, in fact, worded. Nor, I think, would I do otherwise today . . ."[9] Consequently, on 1 May 1945 Doenitz made the following announcement on North German radio:

> The Fuehrer has nominated me as his successor. In full consciousness of my responsibilities I therefore assume the leadership of the German people at this fateful hour. My first task is to save German men and women from destruction by the advancing Bolshevist enemy. It is to serve this purpose alone that the military struggle continues. For as long as the British and the Americans continue to impede the accomplishments of this task, we must also continue to fight and defend ourselves against them. The British and the Americans in that case will not be fighting in the interests of their own peoples, but solely for the expansion of Bolshevism in Europe.[10]

Doenitz also issued his Order of the Day to the Armed Forces on 1 May, covering the same points in slightly different language. And, to counter a growing lack of discipline in the armed forces, he issued the following declaration to the military services: "I expect discipline and obedience. Chaos and ruin can be prevented only by the swift and unreserved execution of my orders. Anyone who at this juncture fails in his duty and condemns German women and children to slavery and death is a traitor and a coward. The oath of allegiance which you took to the *Fuehrer* now binds each and every one of you to me, whom he himself appointed as his successor."[11] It worked. As Doenitz relates: "The next few days showed that the German Armed Forces had accepted my authority; and that was all that mattered." [12]

On 1 May 1945, Doenitz received a third and final radio message from the Berlin chancellery, with the same "Personal and Secret" classification but signed this time by Goebbels and Bormann:

> *Fuehrer* died yesterday, 1530 hours. In his will dated April 29 he appoints you as President of the Reich, Goebbels as Reich Chancellor, Bormann as Party Minister, Seyss-Inquart as Foreign Minister. The will, by order of the *Fuehrer*, is being sent to you and to Field Marshal Schoerner and out of Berlin for safe custody. Bormann will try to reach you today to explain the situation. Form and timing of announcement to the Armed Forces and the public is left to your discretion. Acknowledge. [13]

In a melodramatic series of events, Martin Bormann was killed in Berlin en route to Admiral Doenitz, other ranking officials failed to arrive, and no copies of the pertinent documents ever reached Doenitz. Apparently it never occurred to the officials in the beleaguered chancellery that the entire texts of the pertinent documents could have been radioed to Doenitz. At this point, he did not even know of the subsequent suicide of Goebbels on 1 May. Doenitz correctly felt that he must make his own governmental appointments in order to function at all. He could not logically appoint officials whose whereabouts he did not know (he did not in fact know whether they were alive or dead), or whose prominence in the Hitler government might prejudice negotiations with the Allies. Of this fateful date, 1 May 1945, Doenitz summarized the situation in his *Memoirs*: ". . . while out at sea transports filled with wounded, with refugees and with troops hurried westward, the columns of refugees fleeing overland pressed on towards their salvation and the armies in Pomerania, in Brandenburg and in Silesia continued to retire in the direction of the Anglo-American demarcation line." [14]

It was the plan of Admiral Doenitz to accomplish a partial surrender in the west. For this purpose, the officer commanding

at Hamburg was ordered to dispatch an officer with flag of truce to the British on 3 May, to offer the surrender of Hamburg and to inform them that a general delegation under Admiral von Friedeburg was en route to confer with them.[15] Meanwhile, because of British advances, Doenitz moved his headquarters and seat of government to Muerwik near Flensburg. There he conferred with representatives of the German forces still in being and advised them to take such action as would enable them to surrender to American rather than Russian forces. He had developed a healthy respect for the American Navy, and it for him. But the American ground forces were something else again, their officer corps consisting in large part of Jews, white trash, and blacks. Doenitz had not yet met political generals of the Eisenhower stamp.

There were many acts of heroism at this difficult time. I cite but one here. As Doenitz relates in his *Memoirs*, Dr. Karl Hermann Frank, Protector of Bohemia-Moravia, concerned with Czech worries over the political fate of their nation should it fall into Russian hands, sought the agreement of Doenitz to make an offer to surrender to the Americans. Doenitz thought it unlikely to succeed but worth trying, and he comments: ". . . That Frank, regardless of his own personal safety and with but the slenderest chance of success, should have been willing to return to a country which he knew to be on the brink of revolt in order to secure for it a more humane solution of its problems should be noted to his credit." [16]

On 4 May, Doenitz gave to Admiral von Friedeburg the full authorization to accept various terms of surrender offered by Field Marshal Bernard L. Montgomery, and von Friedeburg was flown to British headquarters with the further instructions to then proceed to General Eisenhower at Rheims to offer a German surrender in the American sector. As Doenitz put it, "The first step towards a separate surrender to the West had been accomplished without our having been forced to abandon German soldiers and civilians to the mercy of the Russians." [17]

Eisenhower proved to be contentious and difficult. On 6 May, Doenitz sent Col. Gen. Alfred Jodl to negotiate with the American martinet, who rejected any separate surrender and informed Jodl that the Americans would be ordered to fire upon any German troops approaching American lines with the intention of surrender, even if unarmed. This, of course, was a direct breach of the Geneva Convention but that did not concern Eisenhower, who took his political orders from the Washington regime. Eisenhower demanded unconditional surrender on 7 May, but Jodl was able to win the concession of 9 May as the date for the termination of hostilities, thus enabling Doenitz to continue moving troops and refugees out of the eastern areas. The history of the formal

signing of the instrument of surrender at Rheims on 7 May 1945 is well known. Jodl and von Friedeburg signed for Germany on the first capitulation document. Doenitz authorized the German delegates—Field Marshal Keitel, Admiral von Friedeburg, and General Stumpff—to sign for the German Armed Forces. The ceremonies were repeated in Berlin-Karlhorst on 8 May at the demand of the Russians. As it turned out, in the course of the surrender negotiations the German representatives were treated courteously by the British and the Russians, but with hostility and child-like contempt by the Americans. This conduct was exemplified by Eisenhower himself, who later censured and otherwise hounded an American brigadier general, Robert J. Stack, for having treated Goering with courtesy on his arrest, and who rebuked General Patch, commander of the U.S. 7th Army, for treating German prisoners of war decently. See Leonard Mosley's book, *The Reich Marshal*, pp320-322.

The final order of the German Armed Forces, issued on 9 May 1945, stated in part:

> . . . By command of Admiral Doenitz the Armed Forces have given up the hopeless struggle. A heroic fight that has lasted for nearly six years thus comes to an end . . . the German Armed Forces have succumbed to overwhelming superior strength . . . Every German soldier, sailor and airman can therefore lay aside his arms with justifiable pride and turn to the task of ensuring the everlasting life of our nation . . . To show obedience, discipline and absolute loyalty to our Fatherland, bleeding from innumerable wounds, is the sacred duty our dead impose upon us all. [18]

As noted by Doenitz in his *Memoirs*: "I thought then, and I still think, that those words are both appropriate and just." [19]

The surrender accomplished, and the cessation of hostilities being secured at even the most distant outposts, Doenitz turned his efforts to the processes of the government which he headed, a regime which had obtained *de facto* status from the Allies by their dealings with it. The legal complexities of the succession are dealt with in *Regierung Doenitz*, by W. Luedde-Neurath, a work published in 1950, but even that work must be read in the light of the repressive political conditions in the western zone of Germany in 1950. The author held that Hitler's nomination of Doenitz as Head of State was unquestionably legal, and that its legality was in no way affected by the loss of German sovereignty occasioned by Allied occupation. Under German law, the resignation of a head of state is possible only when a successor is named at the same time. This would, of course, apply to a self-termination by a head of state (i.e., suicide). When this measure is not taken, the office devolves upon the president of the *Reich* Supreme Court

(Article 51 of the Weimar Constitution). An extinction of the function of head of state is therefore legally excluded.

The Act (law) of 1 August 1934 combined the offices of president and chancellor in the person of Adolf Hitler, and the German people gave its electoral approval to this in the plebiscite of 18 August 1934. Subsequently, Hitler found general recognition as head of state both in his domestic and international dealings. Furthermore, the same law expressly gave to Hitler the right to name his successor. This he did—without any opposition—in his *Reichstag* declaration of 1 September 1939, naming Goering and Hess in that order. Subsequent events and instruments eliminated Hess (following his flight to England) and Goering (by Hitler's interpretation of Goering's attempt to take over Hitler's leadership in late April of 1945). Therefore, Hitler's political testament of 29 April 1945 (naming Doenitz as president and Goebbels as chancellor) took precedence and was the governing authority for the Doenitz government. (See special note p. 333)

To his everlasting credit, Eamon De Valera, Prime Minister (later President) of Eire (Ireland), called personally on the German ambassador to Ireland to offer his condolences on the death of Hitler and his recognition of the new government headed by Doenitz. There is no doubt that, had time permitted, the exchange of diplomatic representatives with neutral nations could have been achieved. Doenitz headed what he felt was, and should be, a new German government in every sense of the term. He wrote: "... it was essential that we should create the requisite state departments within the framework of a central government. It was, however, also essential that we should gather together all our best experts in these various spheres, in order to be able to offer their cooperation to the occupying powers. Our primary task was to ensure for the German people the essentials for bare survival . . ." [20]

The Doenitz government took form, then, to prevent famine; to restore communications, business and industry; to rebuild housing and obtain temporary quarters for the homeless; to try to hold the value of the currency and re-establish banking systems, and to aid the refugees and absorb the additional millions of Germans and non-Germans fleeing the Russian-occupied areas. The Doenitz Cabinet took office: Graf Lutz von Schwerin-Krosigk (Foreign Minister, Minister of Finance, and presiding officer of the Cabinet), Dr. Wilhelm Stuckart (Minister of the Interior and Minister of Culture), Albert Speer (Minister of Industry and Production), Dr. Herbert Backe (Minister of Food, Agriculture and Forests), Dr. Franz Seldte (Minister of Labor and Social Affairs), and Dr. Dorpmueller (Minister of Posts and Communications). All had held secondary posts in the Hitler government but all were es-

sentially non-political men with bureaucratic experience and technical knowledge in their fields. The choice of Speer was an unfortunate one as the man was a self-seeking chameleon and opportunist, although able in his technical fields. Speer at once initiated an internal campaign to convince the Doenitz government to resign. As Doenitz put it: "Speer was emphatic in his opinion that we [the government] should resign. But he thought that, as far as he himself was concerned, the Americans would continue to cooperate with him."[21] Schwerin-Krosigk took a sounder view—that only the Armed Forces had surrendered, the German state continuing to exist with Doenitz as its legal head. As Doenitz remarks: ". . . The enemy themselves had recognized the fact when they insisted on my conferring plenipotentiary powers on the Chiefs of the three services, who were to sign the instrument of surrender . . . I and my provisional government could not voluntarily resign. If we did, the victors could say with justification: since the properly constituted Government . . . had run away, we have no option but to set up independent German governments in the individual zones and to allow our military government to exercise authority over all of them . . .I should stay until I was removed by force. Had I not done so, then . . . I should have supplied the political pretext for the division of Germany that exists today . . ."[22]

An Allied Control Commission under the American Major General Lowell W. Rooks and British Brigadier R.L.S. Foord arrived on the scene shortly after the capitulation, and they were later joined by Soviet Major General Nikolai Trusov. This commission conferred with the Doenitz government but gave little response to its proposals and less cooperation. Doenitz observed: "The attitude of the Allied representatives at these meetings was reserved, but correct. The courtesies of normal international usage were observed, but that I and the members of my government should have shown a like reserve and reticence was only natural."[23] Meanwhile, some progress was made regardless of the non-cooperation of the Allied representatives, particularly in the areas of food procurement and communications. The Cabinet met regularly and worked hard. Interestingly, bureaucracy often lives a life of its own, and some of the administrative offices of the Hitler government moved to the area and continued their work. An SS "think tank," engaged in producing reports on world political affairs, was still in business as of August 1945, and some Nazi intelligence operations were taken over intact by intelligence services of the Allies, notably that of General Reinhardt Gehlen, who had specialized in gathering intelligence concerning the Russians.

Next, a campaign against the Doenitz government was orches-

trated in the Allied nations, an ominous sign. As Doenitz observed:

> The enemy press and particularly the Russian radio began to get busy about "the Doenitz Government" . . . The cooperation between the provisional government and the British and American representatives in Muerwik had aroused their envy . . . Churchill at first opposed my removal. He wanted to use me as a "useful tool" . . . if I proved to be useful, that would have to be reckoned against my "war atrocities in command of submarines" [Churchill, Vol. VI, p646]. This was exactly the coldly calculating attitude that I expected of British policy . . . Then . . . on May 15 Eisenhower demanded my removal in the interests of friendship with Russia . . . [24]

The arrest of the Doenitz government is described in a cynical article by one Corporal Howard Katzander, staff correspondent, in *Yank*, "The Army Weekly," terming the Doenitz government "a grandiose bluff to persuade the Allied command to permit him [Doenitz] to attend to the interior reorganization of the nation's economy," coupled with the disarming of German forces under the very direction of the *Oberkommando der Wehrmacht* (OKW), to "keep intact the nucleus of a new *Wehrmacht* and a new war-minded government." [25] On 23 May 1945, Doenitz, Jodl, von Friedeburg and others were summoned aboard the steamship *Patria*, whereupon General Rooks, wasting no time on protocol or courtesy, communicated Eisenhower's decision that, ". . . in concert with the Soviet High Command . . . today the acting German government and the German high command, with the several of its members, shall be taken into custody as prisoners of war. Thereby, the acting German government is dissolved . . . Troops of the 21st Army Group are taking the several members, civilian and military, and certain records, into custody . . ." [26] Asked by Rooks for any comment, Doenitz replied, "Any words would be superfluous." [27] The members of the Doenitz government and the high command were gathered and marched off, hands behind their heads and at machine-gun point, to a prisoner of war cage. Admiral von Friedeburg chose suicide over Allied detention.

I have discussed at some length the brief tenure of the Doenitz government because of its historical significance. The opposition of the Soviet Union was to be expected. Had the western Allies, however, exhibited some foresight, the history of Europe might have followed a quite different course. A legitimate government cannot be "dissolved" by military order of an external enemy, nor by taking its members forcibly under arrest. Having come legally into power, and having been recognized by the very forces which were to order its "dissolution," the Doenitz government remains in history as the last *de jure* and *de facto* government of

a United Germany. The establishment by the Allies of their own puppet regimes in West Germany (the so-called Federal Republic) and in Central Germany (the so-called German Democratic Republic) merely underscores the continuing zonal occupation of the German nation almost 40 years after the military conclusion of World War II. This is well pointed up by the maintenance of the prison at Spandau in West Berlin, containing one solitary nonagenarian prisoner (Rudolf Hess), and administered in rotation by the governments of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the USSR. Despite some opposition exhibited by the Western puppet regime to its masters, any claim to genuine independence by either the western or eastern puppet regime is ludicrous in view of the continuing military presence in both those countries of the forces of the former Allies.

Grand Admiral Doenitz then, on 23 May 1945, became another prisoner of war, and the staggering burden of reponsibilities for the German nation was taken from his shoulders by jailkeepers. Treated correctly at first in the Allied detention center at Bad Mondorf, Luxemburg, Doenitz had time to reflect on his long career and the events which had brought him to the situation which then faced him.

Doenitz, not born into the class which then provided officers, joined the Imperial German Navy and served on the light cruiser *Breslau* in the Near East, 1914-1916. Thereafter he entered the submarine service, serving as senior lieutenant on *U-39* and in command of *U-68*. After the sinking of his submarine off Malta, he was a British prisoner of war until 1919. He continued to serve in the navy of the Weimar Republic, such as it was, and continued to rise through the grades as a surface officer. Bound by the chains of the Versailles Treaty, Germany had no submarines again until 1935. Doenitz commanded a destroyer, a destroyer flotilla, served on the staff of the Baltic naval forces, and commanded the cruiser *Emden* in the South Atlantic (1934) and the Indian Ocean. In 1935, he was selected to build the new submarine service. He became senior officer of submarines, and was an expert on strategy, developing the tactics used by the U-Boats in World War II, notably the "wolf pack" system which devastated Allied shipping early in the war. He rose through the flag ranks of commodore, rear admiral, vice admiral, and, in 1942, became a full admiral. On 30 July 1943, Doenitz was named a grand admiral (German equivalent of fleet admiral, a five-star rank), and became commander-in-chief of the navy, replacing Grand Admiral Erich Raeder. This has been an extremely abbreviated summary of the naval service of Doenitz. Suffice it to say that he was, without a doubt, the most brilliant U-Boat tactician of all time. Submarines will never again play the major naval role

they played in World War II. The American Admiral Thomas C. Hart (commander of the U.S. Asiatic Fleet at the outbreak of World War II, and later a U.S. Senator) wrote:

> I rate Admiral Doenitz as the best of them all, land or sea. He was unique in his handling of the German submarines and they were our most dangerous enemy. His performance with them—and he did most of it himself—was the most outstanding Axis performance of the war. Then he succeeded to command all German Navy Forces. It was too late for real accomplishment, but he made no mistakes and no one could have done better. Then he succeeded the *Fuehrer* himself, and his performance from there on seems to me to have been perfect. So I think Doenitz was the best. [28]

Karl Doenitz was never a political man, and he took but little interest in the wearisome struggles of German political parties during the Weimar era. But he was an anti-Communist, a conservative, a nationalist, and, above all, a patriot. The principles of National Socialism were bound to appeal to him. According to the Doenitz biography in *Encyclopedia of The Third Reich*, "Doenitz was one of the few convinced National Socialists among high officers in the Navy. He praised Hitler in speeches to his sailors: 'Heaven has sent us the leadership of the *Fuehrer*!' On one occasion he told a cheering crowd in Berlin that Hitler foresaw everything and made no misjudgments . . . Hitler, on his side, had the utmost confidence in Doenitz . . ."[29] Doenitz wrote that his relations with Hitler were always formal and courteous: "I myself never thought about receiving presents or money from Hitler . . . he only called me 'Herr Grossadmiral,' and never by any other name. I welcomed it that way."[30] In his *Memoirs*, Doenitz discusses Hitler's influence on other people, pro and con.

> I myself had often been conscious of this influence, and after spending even a few days at his headquarters, I generally had the feeling that I would have to get away from Hitler's suggestive influence if I were to free myself from it. Further, to me he was not only the legitimate and legally appointed Head of the State, the man to whom I owed obedience, the statesman as distinct from the fighting man, but also a man of high intelligence and great energy . . .[31]

What was Admiral Doenitz like as a person? A gentleman of the old school, he was extremely reserved, a man of few words. He would reply to questions directly but briefly, and seldom expressed his personal feelings. He had a wry sense of humor, but was far from jocular. He had the ability to immediately see the crux of any problem and deal with it, without preliminaries. It was his natural tendency to find only good things to say about others, and in the absence of such, to say nothing. Doenitz was a

family man who did not care for mixing in society, and he often expressed his fondness for dogs and children. His submariners, officers and enlisted men, were the apple of his eye, and he felt closely bound to them. He knew personally as many of them as possible, particularly his U-Boat commanders. Naval personnel uniformly respected him and referred to him as "*Der Loewe*" ("The Lion"). British Admiral of the Fleet Sir George E. Creasy wrote of him: ". . . As a submarine Admiral whom I knew to be held in the deepest admiration and respect by Officers and Men of the U-Boat Fleet, I held Admiral Doenitz in respect myself, and there is no doubt that he handled his U-Boat arm with masterly skill and efficiency. In return he was served with great loyalty."[32]

Doenitz, with the members of his government and other high-ranking members of the Hitler regime, was held at Bad Mondorf until mid-August of 1945. Conditions there were far from luxurious, but acceptable. As noted by the German historian Werner Maser, in his book *Nuremberg: A Nation On Trial*, many of the ranking prisoners of war at Bad Mondorf were under the misapprehension that any trials for "war crimes" would be trivial and insignificant, and that defendants would surely be protected by the fact that they had carried out directives of legally-constituted superiors in a chain of command. Only after their transfer to prison at the so-called Nuremberg "Palace of Justice" did they learn that Chapter VIII of the governing Charter stated: "The fact that the defendant acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior shall not free him from responsibility but may be considered in mitigation of punishment if the Tribunal determine that justice so requires."[33] Needless to say, the tribunal never made any such determination. An all-encompassing indictment was formulated, charging, as criminals, not only virtually every official of any rank in the Hitler government, military and civil, but also every party and military organization of consequence, including the Cabinet, Leadership Corps, SA, SS, SD, and even the General Staff and High Command of the Armed Forces. With the serving of the individual indictments, the status of the prisoners of war became that of accused criminals and they were confined under severe conditions, without any provisions for bail, even though unconvicted, and without any consideration for rank.

Before touching on the Doenitz case at Nuremberg, some general evaluation of the proceedings is necessary. For this purpose, I quote from an analysis of the trials in general written by a distinguished American jurist, Hon. William L. Hart, Justice of the Supreme Court of Ohio (1939-1957) and lecturer on international law:

. . . The tribunal involved was created . . . by what is known as the London Charter entered into on August 8, 1945 by and between four nations—The United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and France—victor nations of World War II, for the purpose of designating and defining certain acts committed in the course of the war as war crimes and the prosecution of certain officials of conquered Germany charged with the commission of such crimes.

The Charter designated and defined three classes of crimes. Class A under which most of the defendants were charged and tried, defined the crime as follows: "The planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression, or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing" . . . Under the heading of "Aggressor Nations," the *Chicago Tribune*, under date of October 2, 1946 . . . carried an editorial which said: "The truth of the matter is that no one of the victors was free of the guilt which its judges attributed to the vanquished." Measured by the Code and standards applied in these trials, it is disturbing to contemplate how the officers of our American forces might have fared had they been tried for their conduct in letting loose the devastation which practically wiped out Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, and Nagasaki on August 9, 1945, the former two days before and the latter the next day after the adoption of the London Charter to which the United States was a party.

In my judgment, the procedure by which the Nuremberg Tribunal was created and the criminal trials thereunder conducted, was completely fraught with illegality . . . American authorities have invariably taken the position that an individual forming a part of a nationally organized army or navy and acting under the authority of his government, cannot be held answerable as a private trespasser or criminal for acts committed under such authority. Such acts are considered acts of the state and not those of the individual . . ." [34]

Here, Justice Hart discusses in some detail the legal precedents, notably Dow v. Johnson, 100 U.S. 158, 163, in which the U.S. Supreme Court held that an officer of the U.S. Army serving in an enemy country could not be held liable for injuries resulting from acts ordered by him in his military capacity. Also the famous McLeod Case (1840), in which Daniel Webster (then Secretary of State) held that an individual acting under the authority of his government could not be held answerable as an individual for acts performed in governmental capacity, it being "a principle of public law sanctioned by all civilized nations, and which the Government of the United States has no inclination to dispute." [35] Justice Hart also deals at length with the attempts, after World War I, to try Kaiser Wilhelm II for alleged "war crimes," and the opposition thereto by U.S. Secretary of State Robert Lansing, and

Dr. James Brown Scott, an eminent American authority on international law. Also the holding of Charles Cherry Hyde in his work on international law that no demands may be made for the surrender of individuals "to be punished criminally on account of acts which were not internationally illegal."[36] Justice Hart continues:

> Furthermore, these four national powers instituting the Nuremberg Trials did not separately or jointly possess any sovereign power to create a special court to try alleged criminal offenses committed outside the territorial jurisdiction of any one of them—a sovereignty necessary under all systems of law to exercise authority over the life and liberty of its subjects within its territorial jurisdiction. Nor did it possess sovereign authority to convict officers of the German forces of so-called criminal offenses not committed within such jurisdiction. It is true that some claim was made that under international law there exists certain "common law" crimes, not specifically created by legal enactment, which crimes existed and were recognized and prosecuted by the Nuremberg Tribunal. But this position was belied by the fact that the powers in question deemed it necessary to specifically define the crimes in the same joint charter which created the tribunal. The London Charter defined the offenses for which the defendants were tried in specific language heretofore quoted.
>
> It has been generally conceded that there is no recognition of sovereign power which is the creation of or operates within the jurisdiction of international law. That none exists is to be inferred from the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, Article 13 of which provides that the General Assembly may "initiate studies and make recommendations—for the purpose inter alia—of encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification." The wording of the provision makes it clear that the Assembly itself is not empowered to create or codify international law, but to encourage the development and codification of such rules by the constituent nations or by international tribunals yet to be created.
>
> There was also much valid criticism expressed in this country at the time of the trials, and since, to the effect that the nations involved in the prosecutions had seen fit to submit the matter of guilt and punishment to a make-shift court created by the prosecuting nations for the one special purpose and which went out of existence immediately upon securing the convictions for which it was organized. From a legal standpoint, there is no answer to this criticism. It was completely justified. The fact is that there does not exist and never has existed any international court or tribunal having jurisdiction to try offenses such as those named in the London Charter.
>
> The designation and definition by the London Charter of the so-called crimes with which the defendants were charged, after such so-called offenses were committed, clearly violated the well-

established rule against ex post facto legislation in criminal matters. The generally accepted doctrine is expressed in the adage: "*Nullum Crimen Sine Lege*"—a person cannot be sentenced to punishment for a crime unless he had infringed a law in force at the time he committed the offense and unless that law prescribed the penalty. Courts in passing on this proposition had declared that: "It is to be observed that this maxim is not a limitation of sovereignty, but is a general principle of justice adhered to by all civilized nations."

In my opinion, there was no legal justification for the trial, conviction or sentence of the so-called "war criminals" by the Nuremberg Tribunal. We have set a bad precedent. It should not be followed in the future.[37]

There are many other valid reasons, not touched upon by Justice Hart, why the "trials" in general were as illegal as they were improper. To enumerate only a few: day-to-day changing of the "rules of evidence," so as to effectively deny to the accused the right of cross-examination guaranteed to them in the Charter; the manufacturing of evidence by the prosecution through the use of forged and/or unverifiable documents; admission into evidence by the prosecution of testimony known by them to be perjured; hindering access of the defendants to their counsel through delays and pettifogging; physical and psychological maltreatment of the defendants, and demoralization through the systematic looting of their personal effects, extending even to tooth powder; denial of a permissible defense in citing similar acts of Allied nations, etc.[38]

Revisionist historians have made some headway in arguments which may hopefully lead to a general repudiation of the entire Nuremberg process. But it is at best an upstream fight against an entrenched establishment, manifest most particularly in the occupation of academia by marauding leftist Jews and *shabbos-goyim*, and of the mainstream publishing industry operated head-to-toe by the enemy. It is therefore particularly pleasing to see an establishment historian come to reason on the subject and successfully sneak it into print. The British journalist-historian, Leonard Mosely, no friend of Germany or National Socialism, has authored 21 books, largely concerning World War II. In his biography of Hermann Goering, he writes:

The International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg was not a trial in the sense that is normally accepted in civilized countries. It had been officially announced before the proceedings began that it would generally follow the practices of British and American courts of law, giving the defendants the right to speak and to cross-examine. But even though the presiding judge, Lord Justice Lawrence, was a venerable British jurist renowned for the impar-

> tiality of his judgments, both he and his American, French, and Russian colleagues knew what was expected of them, and that there could be no question of the principal accused winning acquittal. The defendants were doomed before the trial started, no matter what case they made for themselves in court . . . It is true that three out of the twenty defendants were, in fact, acquitted. But most reporters at the trial could have guessed their number and names from the start [author's note: they were anti-Nazis] . . . The purpose of the tribunal was not to give the accused a fair trial to the extent that they could introduce all kinds of relevant evidence in justification of their actions. That would have proved embarrassing . . . their lawyers were warned that all attempts to implicate the Soviet Union would be disallowed . . . There are some jurists who still maintain that Nuremberg was a perfectly valid legal process . . . But in fact it was just as much a political trial as any which had taken place in Russia . . .[39]

Some "liberal" elements in the U.S. continue to attempt to justify the Nuremberg process, imagining that they are thereby defending and asserting the so-called "rights of humanity." But the Nuremberg "trials," as well as the efforts to justify them, will someday be looked upon by historians and the more literate elements of the general population with the contempt which they so richly deserve. Nuremberg will come to be regarded as a monstrous error, similar in degree to the fateful intervention of the United States on the wrong side in two world wars. The World War I intervention was supposedly to "make the world safe for democracy" and to "end all wars." The first premise was undesirable, the second impossible. The equally evil intervention in World War II, a surrender to the agitation of the British, the Jews, and "internationalistic eggheads," in that order, began with "lend lease," "Bundles For Britain," and military-economic give-aways long before any formal declaration of war. It, too, was accomplished by fulsome slogans about defending the rights of humanity, saving oppressed mankind, and similar garbage. After all that saving and crusading, a new dawn of universal peace and brotherhood was supposed to follow. Take a look around you. The Nuremberg "trials" were primarily the result of neurotic hysteria, hatred, and hypocrisy. Yet there was a small, secondary, contributing element which purported to believe that "humanity" would somehow be nobly and idealistically served by the holding of such trials.

A study of recent U.S. government and Amnesty International reports on political killings should give those "humanists" some food for thought. Half a million people have been exterminated by the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, another half a million in Indonesia, and millions more in various African "states." In the name of religious idealism, executions multiply in Iran. And in the name

of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—the three-headed beast—the killing continues in that unholiest of lands, crazily called the "Holy" Land. Meanwhile, on the domestic U.S. legal front, liberals, "humanitarians," and so-called lovers of democracy are zealous in their endeavors to protect the "rights" of real criminals, such as murderers, rapists, and thieves. These same liberal elements continually agitate for more "war crimes trials," for more hounding and hunting of alleged Nazis in this country and throughout the world, many of them refugees from Communist tyranny in Eastern Europe. These same "anti-Fascist" liberals, anxious to pursue and punish "Nazis," fail to show the same zeal for domestic criminals, real criminals, the perpetrators of violent crimes. On the contrary, they are opposed to capital punishment and obsessed with the rights of criminals.

Why this discrepancy? Something in the Jewish psyche requires that their media pots be kept boiling with constantly renewed stories of more and more "Nazis" being hunted and brought to "justice." Jewish persecution mania requires constant feeding to keep it in bloom. An Eichmann trial, a Nuremberg lynching, or a Barbie proceeding every year would amply suit the professional, fund-raising Jews.

The Nuremberg "trials" and the numerous "war crimes," "de-Nazification," and similar proceedings which followed them, are ideologically as ludicrous and deserving of contempt as America's intervention in two world wars to "make the world safe for democracy" and to "save oppressed humanity." What is *not* ludicrous, however, is the massive human suffering caused by the pernicious meddling of the United States of America in the affairs of its betters.

What were the *real* origins of the Nuremberg proceedings? How did the U.S. fall into this quagmire of hypocrisy and lend its offices and personnel to a victors' tribunal falsely represented as some sort of noble experiment in international law? Some of the sinister background is well developed in the book *The Road to Nuremberg* by Professor Bradley F. Smith. Certainly no friend of Germany or of revisionism (which he attacks), Prof. Smith, knowingly or not, reveals the Jewish origins of the "trials" and shows that they were essentially an *American* production. Among the "cast of characters" in Smith's book are Henry Morgenthau Jr., Murray C. Bernays, Sidney Alderman, Bernard Bernstein, Felix Frankfurter, Sheldon Gluck, Hersch Lauterpacht, William Malkin, Sam I. Rosenman (adviser to F.D. Roosevelt), Herbert Wechsler, Frederick Bernays Weiner, and Harry Dexter White (Weiss, the Russian agent), as well as the American Jewish Conference, to name but a few. The struggle of Henry L. Stimson against the malicious influences of Henry Morgenthau, Jr., is interestingly

recorded. Of Stimson, Smith writes, ". . . Stimson was a social anti-Semite. . . . His diary entries include references to Morgenthau's 'race' and his 'Semitic' characteristics. . . . Stimson decried the fact that Morgenthau had taken the lead in advocating harsh peace terms. Specifically, he believed that this could rebound and provide ammunition for those who would attribute all stringent controls on Germany to a mere 'Jewish' desire for revenge."[40]

In discussing the trials of Nazi organizations, Smith notes: "For the system to work as intended, the prosecution had to convince a court, which was trying to appear legally respectable, that it should overlook shaky evidence, as well as its scruples, and condemn millions of organization members on the basis of collective guilt . . ."[41] As a clue to the Americanization of the entire Nuremberg process, Smith writes, "After carping at American planning—filling the hallways with snide remarks—even most British officials ultimately admitted that American energy and determination had beaten the odds and turned Nuremberg into a more successful enterprise than had been thought possible."[42]

The influence of Morgenthau and his ilk in promoting the ill-conceived doctrines of unconditional surrender, harsh occupation terms, and trials of the defeated German leadership, in fact prolonged the war. Admiral Doenitz was well aware of this:

> We knew of American Treasury Secretary Morgenthau's plan which, after victory, would have destroyed Germany to make it pasture land and an agricultural nation. If his plan would have succeeded, millions of Germans would have starved. For reasons decided at the Casablanca Conference, the Allies would have made peace with Germany but only under the condition that we surrender completely. That would have meant that German troops would stay where they stood at that time, lay down their weapons, and become prisoners of the enemy. That would have been three-and-one-half million soldiers on the Eastern Front which, in 1944 and 1945, stood far inside Russia, and it would have been impossible to provide these troops with food and shelter, even with the best organization . . . These were the reasons why we did not surrender. The decision to ask for unconditional surrender at Casablanca was a political mistake.[43]

Doenitz was magnificently defended at Nuremberg by *Flottenrichter* Captain Otto Kranzbuehler, a naval judge advocate. In a chapter on Doenitz in his book on Nuremberg, Werner Maser furnishes a lengthy account of the Doenitz defense, recommended for those interested in the details. Despite a remarkable defense supported even by American Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Doenitz was convicted and sentenced to ten years imprisonment, a light sentence compared to others meted out, but not light for an

innocent man who had to serve every day of it, and more. Of what precisely the Grand Admiral was convicted, we shall never know. The legal authority H.A. Smith, Professor of International Law in the University of London, held that ". . . The clumsiness and obscurity of this language [findings in the Doenitz case] perhaps indicate the embarrassment which the members of the Tribunal felt in dealing with the case of Doenitz, and it is not easy to ascertain from the rest of the judgment the precise facts upon which he was condemned."[44] Hon. S.A. Rahman, Chief Justice of Pakistan, wrote: ". . . apart from the question of the validity or desirability of the Nuremberg trials, the guilt of Doenitz . . . could not be said to have been established beyond a reasonable doubt on the basis of the material before the Special Tribunal."[45] Rear Admiral Dan V. Gallery, U.S. Navy, summed it up:

> The outstanding example of barefaced hypocrisy at Nuremberg was the trial of Admiral Doenitz. We tried him on three charges: (1) Conspiring to wage aggressive war; (2) Waging aggressive war; and (3) Violation of the laws of war at sea. Even the loaded court at Nuremberg acquitted him of the first charge, but convicted him of the other two. How in the name of common sense a military officer can wage any kind of war except an aggressive one without being a traitor to his country, I'll never know. . . . Doenitz's conviction on charge three . . . was an insult to our own submariners. . . . The only crime he committed was that of almost beating us in a bloody but "legal" fight. . . . The Nuremberg trials placed a solemn stamp of approval on a code of war at sea which we not only didn't follow ourselves in World War II but which may embarrass us in the future . . ."[46]

Here it should be noted that Admiral Gallery has employed the layman's definition of "aggressive," rather than that of the international lawyer—which is absolutely permissible because the Nuremberg Tribunal failed to offer any definition of "aggressive war" whatsoever. Doenitz himself covered the legal point in an interview with William Buchanan in *The Boston Sunday Globe*, 8 December 1963:

> . . . The newly created principle of law does not define clearly what an aggressive war is. Because whether a war is an aggressive one or not is purely a political question. Politics of every country will try to prove that the other is the aggressor or that one's own country must feel so threatened that it was compelled to act in self-defense. So if . . . the participation of an individual soldier in an aggressive war will be punishable in future by this new Nuremberg proposition of law, every single soldier of every nation would have to be accorded the right at the outbreak of hostilities to ask his government to account for its actions and to grant him access to all political documents so that he may form his

> own judgment as to whether he will be taking part in a war of aggression or not.[47]

Following his sentencing on 1 October 1946, Admiral Doenitz served his time, bravely and without complaint, at the old Spandau prison in West Berlin. Under any Western system, the conditions of imprisonment would have constituted "cruel and unusual punishment," and would have been ameliorated by courts. The German leadership was ill-treated, ill-fed, and ill-clothed, under monstrous conditions, with every manner of petty torture and indignity imposed upon the elderly prisoners. They knew little of the events of the outer world, had only a very limited and highly supervised contact with their families, and had but little contact with each other. Doenitz maintained his dignity through his inner strength, and he never wrote of his prison experiences in books or articles, unlike the little rodent, Albert Speer, who twisted facts and altered "reminiscences" to obtain fat contracts from the establishment publishers for his confessionals. Speer, anxious to "confess" to anything which the prosecutors might suggest, sought at Nuremberg to assume "moral responsibility" for anything which had transpired in Hitler Germany, even what the travelling salesman did to the farmer's daughter. He maligned those defendants who stood up to the court, including Doenitz. In his Spandau diaries (18 March 1948), Speer noted, however: ". . . Doenitz abruptly and aggressively says to me that the Nuremberg verdict made a mockery of all justice. . . . I cannot deny that Doenitz is partially right in his rejection of the Nuremberg verdicts,"[48] and on 10 December 1947, Speer recorded, ". . . For all his personal integrity and dependability on the human plane, Doenitz has in no way revised his view of Hitler. To this day, Hitler is still his commander in chief."[49] In an entry on 3 February 1949, Speer complained: "Schirach, Raeder and Doenitz are distinctly cool toward me. . . . They disapprove of my consistent and basic rejection of the Third Reich."[50] Of special interest is a Speer diary entry of 20 January 1953, in which he quotes the reaction of Doenitz to the election of Theodor Heuss as President of puppet West Germany: ". . . He [Heuss] was installed under pressure from the occupying powers. Until all political parties, including the National Socialists, are permitted to function and until they elect someone else, my legitimacy remains. Nothing can change that one iota. Even if I wanted it changed. . . . Even if I renounced the office I would remain chief of state, because I cannot renounce it until I have appointed a successor . . ."[51]

During 1952-1953, a remarkable and fascinating plan was developed in West Germany, with roots extending to Spain, Argentina, and even the United States, for the liberation of the Spandau prisoners by commando-type military action, and the setting up of

the Doenitz government elsewhere as a legitimate government-in-exile. Although the financing was available, and many dedicated men were involved, security was compromised in Germany and the matter became a field day for Allied journalism, resulting in a number of arrests. The full facts were never known and never will be, even though most of those involved are now deceased. Just a few years ago, I had the pleasure of burning a file on the subject which had been eagerly sought by at least four intelligence agencies for many years.

Rather, more legal attempts were made to secure the release of Grand Admiral Doenitz. On 19 May 1955, Dr. Kranzbuehler requested the intervention of the West German regime with its Allied masters to secure the deletion from his sentence of 16 months spent in incarceration before and during trial.[52] Under most Western systems of jurisprudence, this is a routine procedure. On 27 May the Allies denied the request.[53] They were to make Doenitz serve every day of the Nuremberg sentence. The Allies regarded him as unrepentant and they feared political repercussions should Doenitz attempt to resume his function as Head of State, for which, by then, no small amount of support existed in West Germany among rightist groups, patriotic organizations, and the large associations of World War II veterans, with their growing economic and political clout.

On 1 October 1956, Doenitz was released, and the event was widely heralded in the world press. On the scene, there were altercations between the police and the press. Various newsmen were clubbed in an effort to keep them from the Grand Admiral. "Police told newsmen they were acting on Western orders. The Western Allies, in a first reaction, either disclaimed knowledge of the incidents or attempted to lay the blame elsewhere."[54] The *New York Herald Tribune*, terming Doenitz as the "Least Repentant War Criminal," claimed that the Bonn regime "exercised pressure behind the scenes to discourage demonstrations on his behalf," and cited with alarm not only the political popularity of Doenitz with "Right-wing groups," but claimed that Mrs. Karl Doenitz "is reported to have maintained contact in recent years with active neo-Nazi elements."[55] The Grand Admiral himself commented sensibly: "You must remember I have been isolated and cut off from the world for eleven and a half years. Therefore I am not in any position to pass any judgment or have any opinions . . . My only task is to be silent. I must feel my way back in the world."[56]

Time magazine, on 24 September 1956, in an article headed "The Lion Is Out," repeated old smears of Doenitz, attributing to him remarks which he never made. On 22 October 1956, *Time* published my rebuttal. Terming their article "so much hogwash,"

I stated that "Doenitz, a capable professional naval officer, was 'convicted' by the illegal Nuremberg tribunal for exactly the same 'ruthless' acts committed by U.S. and British admirals. The only difference is that Germany lost the war."[57]

There were many other voices. *The Chicago Tribune*, in its editorial of October 6, 1956, summed it up capably:

> Grand Adm. Karl Doenitz . . . has completed his 10 year sentence as a "war criminal" and has been released from Spandau prison in Berlin. He was sentenced by an international tribunal at Nuremberg, acting under ex post facto "law" invented for the occasion. The penalties prescribed were never legislated by any lawmakers, but by representatives of the victor countries who then took over the prosecution. The presence of Adm. Doenitz among the defendants presented the victors with an unforeseen embarrassment. He was charged with having conducted unrestricted submarine warfare. The tribunal reluctantly admitted that, in assessing this charge, an order of the British admiralty, dated May 8, 1940, directing that all vessels in the Skagerrak should be sunk without warning, could not be disregarded. The tribunal was also obliged to take cognizance of the undisputed fact that the United States, from the first day of the war, had also waged unrestricted submarine warfare . . . Nevertheless, the blanket charges against the defendants of planning, preparing, initiating, or conducting aggressive war were sufficiently broad to produce a finding that Adm. Doenitz was guilty of something—probably the crime of fighting, as a professional officer, in the service of his country. He got 10 years—a verdict proving once again that might makes right, and that hypocrisy can surmount all obstacles. [58]

My own involvement with Admiral Doenitz was continuing and considerable. During his incarceration I maintained contact with Mrs. Inga Doenitz, a magnificent, patriotic woman whose two sons had been lost in World War II naval service. The nullification of the Nuremberg verdict in the Doenitz case—and all the others—and the refurbishing of the Grand Admiral's reputation in world opinion were among my objectives. Long before the release of Doenitz, an *ad hoc* committee had been formed in the United States under the direction of myself and Professor Henry Strutz, with the active assistance of a group of retired U.S. Navy admirals of high World War II rank, including T.C. Hart and Charles A. Lockwood, for the purpose of compiling testimonials for Admiral Doenitz from military and other world leaders. Despite the active hostility of the U.S. government, its intelligence and secret police agencies, Jewish pressure groups, the so-called American Legion, the Bonn puppet, and others, the project was a notable success. The compilation of endorsements of Doenitz enabled his lawyers to force the Bonn regime to pay him a retirement pension commensurate with his rank, whereas they

had tried to pension him off as a lower-ranking officer, claiming that he owed his promotions to Hitler. Leather-bound volumes of the letters and documents were presented to Doenitz and used by him in various ways. Even in *The Encyclopedia of the Third Reich*, it is noted that "He [Doenitz] always kept with him a file of letters from Allied naval officers who had written to him expressing their sympathy and understanding."[59]

The public relations campaign for Doenitz gradually took root. On 28 August 1958, in a *New York Times* article captioned "Doenitz Gaining in Public Prestige," it was noted that just 22 months after his release from Spandau, "Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz has emerged as a nostalgic public figure in West Germany . . . the benign ghost of Germany's old spartan naval tradition. This role, modestly played, has restored Doenitz' prestige in German naval circles . . ."[60]

While it had never been so intended, part of the Doenitz testimonial collection was published as a book, *Doenitz at Nuremberg: A Re-Appraisal*, the first edition appearing in 1976 and the second, expanded edition appearing in 1983 under the imprint of the Institute For Historical Review. I would like to cite merely two contributions to the work which I consider particularly significant. Field Marshal Lord Henry Maitland Wilson of Libya, Supreme Allied Commander in the Mediterranean theatre, wrote: "During my period of Command in the Middle East and Mediterranean Theatres, there were no breaches of International Maritime Law by the Axis Powers reported to me. . . . the Nuremberg Trials were staged as a political stunt."[61] And Tom C. Clark, Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court (1949-1967) and U.S. Attorney-General at the time of the Nuremberg proceedings, wrote of the book: ". . . The series of opinions expressed by executives, legislators, jurists, militarists, writers, diplomats and royalty run the gamut of concerned leaders of our time. These learned minds not only isolate the Nuremberg 'principle,' placing it in right perspective, but at the same time cite the able and devoted Admiral as a victim of the precept. I hail this anthology as required reading for all who are interested in equal justice under law for the defeated as well as the victorious."[62]

Following his release from Spandau, Admiral Doenitz promptly went to work on his memoirs, the German edition of which (*10 Jahre und 21 Tage*) appeared in 1958, to be followed by an English and an American edition (see bibliography). Getting the memoirs of Doenitz into print in Germany in 1958 was a major problem. It would have been better to wait for some years, but of course the Grand Admiral did not know how long he would live. It was necessary to make undesired concessions. Thus the memoirs are largely concerned with the naval war and submarine strategy.

There is no discussion of the Spandau years (which, in any case, Doenitz would not discuss), criticism of the Allies is limited, and any discussion of the Nuremberg proceedings is confined to specific issues, largely concerning the conduct of the naval war. There is some criticism of National Socialism, largely confined to the "leadership principle," with a bone thrown to "democracy," and some criticism of the camps, which Doenitz opposed in principle. He was of the opinion that the concentration camp concept had first been employed by the British against the Boers in South Africa, and was amused to learn from me that "concentration camps" were originated by the American patriarch, General George Washington, to handle the troublesome Quakers during the American Revolution. Because of their opposition to war, he rounded them up and herded them into camps where he left them to starve unless fed by other Quaker sympathizers. The concept flowered again in the sinister mind of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who herded Americans of Japanese ancestry into such camps in the World War II era. All nations have had their share of detention and labor camps, even the Nazis, but it was an American concept pure and simple.

The Doenitz *Memoirs*, in their various editions, were generally well received. In reviewing the English edition, H.R.G. Whates, in an article captioned "A Formidable Antagonist of Britain," in *The Birmingham Post* of 9 May 1959, wrote:

> . . . From it emerges a picture of an upright, non-political naval officer with brilliant and original ideas on the employment of U-Boats as destroyers of shipping. A man who might have won the war for Germany if he had been given the three hundred U-boats for which he asked. . . . Sadly, Doenitz quotes Nelson: "Only numbers can annihilate." He never had the numbers.[63]

In 1962, Mrs. Doenitz died at age 69, and the Grand Admiral moved into a small bachelor's apartment in Aumuehle, a suburb of Hamburg where, surrounded by his naval prints and silver, he continued to write books and professional articles, receive old comrades, and correspond extensively with historians who sought his views. The navy of the Bonn puppet ignored him in the main, but Doenitz took pleasure in addressing groups of former servicemen, who always received him enthusiastically. By old navy tradition, commanding officers of foreign naval vessels visiting the port of Hamburg called on Doenitz as they would on the senior officer present, much to the consternation of Bonn. Doenitz also remained active in aiding the cause of so-called "war criminals" still in Allied custody. I remained in close contact with the Grand Admiral, assisting him wherever and whenever I could.

On 27 July 1980, I received a warm letter from Doenitz, signed with an aged, shaking hand, expressing the hope that we might meet again. This was not to be. On 24 December 1980, he died peacefully in his 89th year. The jackals went quickly to work. The Bonn regime denied him military honors and ordered no wearing of uniforms at his services, which were crowded with former servicemen of high and low rank, seeking to pay their last respects. The obituaries were varied, generally favorable in Germany (with notable exceptions), respectful in England, and nasty, semi-literate hack jobs in the United States. As one might expect, the wire services went right to the old World War II propaganda files and the Nuremberg garbage, with no attempt whatever to bring matters up to date. The *New York Times* was among the worst, which did not surprise me. I have always referred to that so-called newspaper as "the Zionist rag." H.L. Mencken, I believe, called it, "a pompously sterile sheet." At any rate, the story was over. Karl Doenitz passed into history.

With the death of the Grand Admiral, the controversy over his legitimacy as Head of State passed into limbo. During the late 1970's the matter had been revived in an unfortunate way. A right-wing radical in Germany, one Manfred Roeder, sought to proclaim himself "Regent of the Reich" and issued, through a collaborator in Buffalo, N.Y., a formal protocol bearing the forged signature of Admiral Doenitz, implying his agreement to this ludicrous proposition. On 22 September 1978, an editorial in the *Deutsche National Zeitung*, a right-wing newspaper in Germany, stated: "Errant spirits who pass themselves off as 'right-wingers' have recently tried to create the impression that they were acting on behalf of Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz when they claim for themselves the function of a 'Regency of the Reich.' The Grand Admiral has expressed himself as follows on the subject . . ."[64] There followed a lengthy statement dated at Aumuehle on 2 July 1975, in which Doenitz pointed out that, after the passage of then some 30 years, the serious possibility of his claiming the office of President of the Reich had to be ruled out. He continued:

> In my statement of May 1, 1945, I did in fact very consciously characterize myself not as President of the Reich but as Head of State. I did so in order not to render more difficult the purely factual process of the exercise of the supreme power of government by complicating it with constitutional-legal problems. This *de facto* exercise of the supreme governmental power most certainly came to an end decades ago. In this connection, I leave it to historians to determine the precise moment when. After my release from Spandau jail in 1956, when theoretically I might have done so, I never declared that I continued to regard myself as

> President of the German Reich. Because of the political circumstances which have since developed, such a declaration would not only have been of no consequence legally, but also politically unwise . . . [it] . . . could only have had a deleterious effect on the will to re-unification of the entire German people.[65]

There was disagreement among those who advised Doenitz as to the wisdom of his statement. I for one, would sooner have seen a successor nominated, but, as Doenitz argued, who would be suitable? (My suggestion was *Generalmajor* Otto Ernst Remer, the exemplary patriot who had put down the cowardly 20 July 1944 plot.) The German radical who backed Doenitz into this corner now languishes in a West German jail—on other grounds to be sure, but the Bonn puppet has a long arm and no sense whatever of law or of individual rights. One thing seems certain: no future government of a United Germany can take office without a claim of continuity based on the Doenitz government, the last government of the Reich.

When Admiral Doenitz emerged from Spandau prison in 1956, he re-entered an alien world, the events of the prior ten years and more having in the main been withheld from him. He thought that the German people were the same people he knew in the 1930s and 1940s. But they were not. By 1960, the youth had been almost totally Americanized. The Coca-Cola culture had taken root, with its "hippies," its negroid music, its militant labor unions, its put-down of patriotism, its rejection of race, of family and of cultural values. These were the fruits of the American "re-education" policy in Germany. Like the American, the German no longer wished to work but merely to receive pay. Gone were quality and craftmanship, gone were German energy and creativity. The German woman had become "too good" to perform household tasks, for which Eastern Europeans, Asians and Africans were and are imported. Within a few decades, statisticians tell us, Germany will cease to be German, and will be dominated by alien races, run by leftist labor union combines. Admiral Doenitz lived to see these changes. He came to regret any favorable words written in support of "democracy," and, in the end, found solace in the strength of his own National Socialist spirit.

In conclusion, I would like to recall a line in Adolf Hitler's last political testament in which he invoked the faith of "all Germans, all National Socialists." Little can be expected from Germany or from Germans in the years ahead. But Hitler knew well that all National Socialists were not Germans. The doctrines will survive and the movement will take root, grow and flower among generations not yet born, in nations where it might least be expected. This would please a man like Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz. Criticizing Doenitz, a hostile West German obituary cited a recent

statement by him that he had nothing to apologize for and that, if he had the opportunity to relive his life, he would have done everything the same way. Such men are rare in history. Upon the release of Doenitz in 1956, I joined with the writer and historian, George Sylvester Viereck, in a telegram to the Grand Admiral:

> On the day of the triumph of your steeled will over the plans of your vengeful persecutors, your American friends congratulate you and wish you a long, healthy life. Throughout the entire despicable Nuremberg proceedings—brought about by the criminal co-guilt of the U.S.A. and world Jewry, your soldierly honor shone forth as the sole hope of those who wished to rebuild the collapsing Western World.
>
> Through your personal courage, you have triumphed over the calculated plans of the destroyers of Western Culture, and you stand today as the personification of Honor, Loyalty and Faith. Let no considerations dissuade you from this position. You are unique in history![66]

Notes

1. Ulick Varange [Francis Parker Yockey], *Imperium* (London: Westropa Press, 1948), dedication page.
2. Karl Doenitz, *Memoirs* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1959), p. 438.
3. Louis L. Snyder, *Encyclopedia of the Third Reich* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), pp. 165-66 [translation into English of the basic document].
4. *Ibid.*
5. Doenitz, p. 441.
6. *Ibid*, p. 442.
7. *Ibid*, p. 444.
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid*, p. 445.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid*, p. 451.
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid*, p. 452.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid*, p. 453.
16. *Ibid*, p. 455.
17. *Ibid*, p. 459.
18. *Ibid*, p. 466.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid*, p. 470.
21. *Ibid*, p. 471.
22. *Ibid*, p. 472.

23. *Ibid*, p. 473.
24. *Ibid.*
25. Howard Katzander [staff correspondent], in *Yank: The Army Weekly* (May 1945).
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*
28. Hart quote in [Lieutenant] R.M. Ancell, Jr., "Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz: Reflections at 80," *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings* (March 1973), p. 120.
29. Snyder, p. 71.
30. Ancell, p. 121.
31. Doenitz, pp. 476-77.
32. H. Keith Thompson and Henry Strutz (eds.), *Doenitz at Nuremberg: A Re-Appraisal* (New York: Amber, 1976; second, revised ed. Torrance, Calif.: Institute for Historical Review, 1983), p. 115.
33. Werner Maser, *Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial* (New York: Scribners 1979), p. 35.
34. Thompson and Strutz, pp. xvii-xx.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Ibid.*
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid* [editor's introduction].
39. Leonard Mosley, *The Reich Marshal* (New York: Doubleday, 1974), pp. 335-36.
40. Bradley F. Smith, *The Road to Nuremberg* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), p. 31.
41. *Ibid*, pp. 249-50.
42. *Ibid.*
43. Ancell, p. 120.
44. H.A. Smith, *The Law and Custom of the Sea* (London: Stevens & Sons, second ed. 1954), p. 176.
45. Handwritten letter to H. Keith Thompson, possession of the author.
46. Dan V. Gallery [Rear Admiral, U.S.N.], *Twenty Million Tons Under the Sea* (Chicago: Regnery, 1957), from the epilogue.
47. Doenitz's comments in *Boston Sunday Globe* (8 December 1963), p. A-11.
48. Albert Speer, *Spandau: The Secret Diaries* (New York: Macmillan, 1976), p. 45.
49. *Ibid*, p. 81.
50. *Ibid*, p. 119.
51. *Ibid*, p. 220.
52. Reuters dispatch, *New York Times* (19 May 1955).
53. *New York Daily News* (27 May 1955). *Time* (6 June 1955).
54. Joseph Fleming [United Press dispatch] in *New York World Telegram and Sun* (1 October 1956).
55. Gaston Coblentz in *New York Herald Tribune* (1 October 1956).
56. *New York World Telegram and Sun* (1 October 1956).
57. H. Keith Thompson in *Time* (22 October 1956).
58. *Chicago Tribune* (6 October 1956), lead editorial.
59. Fisher, p. 72.
60. Arthur J. Olsen in *New York Times* (28 August 1958).

61. Thompson and Strutz, p. 48.
62. *Ibid*, p. 196.
63. H.R.G. Whates, "A Formidable Antagonist of Britain," *Birmingham Post* [Birmingham, England] (9 May 1959).
64. Doenitz, statement prompted by the Roeder affair [with editorial comment], *Deutsche National-Zeitung* No. 39 (22 September 1978).
65. *Ibid.*
66. Joint telegram of George Sylvester Viereck and H. Keith Thompson to Grand Admiral Doenitz, 1 October 1956; transmission copy in the Viereck-Thompson Collection, University of Iowa.

Special Note (*ref. p. 311*): On 26 April 1942, the *Reichstag* voted absolute wartime powers to Hitler, suspending any laws to the contrary, similar to the powers conferred on President Abraham Lincoln during the American Civil War.

Select Bibliography

Ancell, R.M., Jr. "Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz: Reflections at 80," *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings* (March 1973).

Belgion, Montgomery. *Victors' Justice*. Hinsdale, Ill.: Regnery, 1949.

Bosch, William J. (ed.). *Judgement on Nuremberg*. Raleigh, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1970.

Busch, Harald. *So War der U-Boot Krieg*. Bielefeld: Deutscher Heimat Verlag, 1952.

Doenitz, Karl. Extensive original correspondence with H. Keith Thompson, 1938-1980, in possession of the author.

——. *Zehn Jahre und Zwanzig Tage*. Bonn: Athenaeum-Verlag, 1958.

——. *Memoirs*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1959. (English translation by R.H. Stevens.)

——. "Die Schlacht im Atlantik in der deutschen Strategie des Zweiten Weltkrieges," *Marine Rundschau* [Frankfurt: Verlag E.S. Mittler & Sohn] 61 Jahrgang, Heft 2 (April 1964).

——. *Mein wechselvolles Leben*. Goettingen: Musterschmidt-Verlag, 1968.

——. *La Guerre en 40 Questions*. Paris: La Table Ronde, 1969. (French translation by Bernard George.)

Esser, Hermann. *Die juedische Weltpest*. Munich: Franz Eher Verlag, 1939.

Fells, Maximilian. *Doenitz in Nuernberg und Danach*. Privately published in honor of Doenitz's 75th birthday, 1972.

Fishman, Jack. *The Seven Men of Spandau*. New York: Rinehard & Co., 1954.

Hitler, Adolf (Francois Genoud, ed.). *The Testament of Adolf Hitler: The Hitler-Bormann Documents February-April 1945*. London: Cassell & Co., 1959.

Goerlitz, Walter. *Karl Doenitz der Grossadmiral*. Goettingen: Musterschmidt-Verlag, 1972.

Luedde-Neurath, Walter. *Regierung Doenitz*. Goettingen: Musterschmidt-Verlag, 1955.

Martienssen, Anthony. *Hitler and His Admirals*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1948.

—— (ed.). *Fuehrer Conferences on Naval Affairs*. London: Admiralty series.

Maser, Werner. *Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial*. New York: Scribners, 1979. (English translation by Richard Barry.)

Moll, Otto E. *Die Deutschen Generalfeld-Marschaelle 1935-1945*. Rastatt: Erich Pabel Verlag, 1961.

Mosley, Leonard. *The Reich Marshal*. New York: Doubleday, 1974.

von der Porten, Edward P. *The German Navy in World War II*. New York: Crowell, 1969. (Foreword by Grand Admiral Doenitz.)

Reel, A. Frank. *The Case of General Yamashita*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Smith, Bradley F. *The Road to Nuremberg*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Smith, H.A. *The Law and Custom of the Sea*. London: Stevens & Sons, 1954.

Speer, Albert. *Inside the Third Reich*. New York: Bonanza Books, 1970. (English translation by Richard and Clara Winston.)

——. *Spandau: The Secret Diaries*. New York: Macmillan, 1976. (English translation by Richard and Clara Winston.)

Stockhorst, Erich. *Fuenftausend Koepfe*. Blick und Bild Verlag, 1967.

Thompson, H. Keith, and Strutz, Henry (eds.). *Doenitz at Nuremberg: A Re-Appraisal*. New York: Amber, 1976; 2nd, revised ed. Torrance, Calif.: Institute for Historical Review, 1983.

Toland, John. *Adolf Hitler*. New York: Doubleday, 1976.

Jurist, A. [Veale, F.J.P.]. *Advance to Barbarism*. London: Thomson & Smith, 1948; New York: Devin-Adair, 1953, 1968; Torrance, Calif.: Institute for Historical Review, 1979.

Veale, F.J.P. *War Crimes Discreetly Veiled*. London: Cooper Book Co., 1958; Torrance, Calif.: Institute for Historical Review, 1979.

Gnostic Origins of Alfred Rosenberg's Thought

JAMES B. WHISKER

It has been said that the Christian opponent of Judaism has but two alternatives: to de-Judaize Christ or to deny Him. Houston Stewart Chamberlain, following many theologians of middle Europe in the 19th Century, attempted to prove that Jesus was an Aryan living in an isolated area of Gallilee, and separated racially from the rest of the peoples of the region. The author of *Foundations of the 19th Century* attempted to show that an isolated group of Nordics had been cut off from the mainstream of the nation, and that Christ was descended from such people. Field Marshal Ludendorf and others merely denied the relevance of Jesus, and were anti-Christian as well as anti-Hebrew. These two traditions accepted in common the idea that the Bible, Old and New Testaments alike, was literal history.

A third possibility underlies Rosenberg's thought. The origins are rooted in pre-Christian ideas and practices commonly known in the West as gnosticism. Like many other generic terms, gnosticism is used by many to cover a wide variety of philosophical-theological ideas. Because of the success of the Western church, including its more recent Protestant forms, the systems which were vanquished in the long struggle for religious supremacy in Christendom are thought of in a totally negative context. Such names as Marcionite, gnostic, Manichaean, and Bogomilite, are perjoratives. Most of what was known about them was either

secretly guarded or was learned from reading the refutations of opponents or the accounts of one or another Inquisition, including the interrogations (most often of unlearned members under torture) of those who were accused of heresy.

In the 20th Century there have been two major developments which have changed what we know about the various "heresies." One is the discovery of major documents and treatises either by leading gnostics or by their closest disciples and followers. The other development is the interest shown by leaders of the Third Reich in these movements, and the subsequent study of the ideology in terms of such thought. Among the major works to appear reinterpreting the National Socialist movement in such terms are Pauwels and Bergiers' *The Morning of the Magician* (in French, and translated into many languages), Ravenscroft's *The Spear of Destiny* and *The Cup of Destiny* and Angebert's *The Occult and the Third Reich.*

Most of the authors who have rediscovered the gnostics and their influence on the Third Reich have assumed that the leaders kept the bases of knowledge secret, usually in the SS shrines and rituals, and that this special knowledge was never intended for mass distribution. Only the few specially selected SS types could be entrusted with the age-old secrets. Even in the pre-Third Reich State, Rosenberg had distributed his essay on the origins of Nazi ideology (actually written before the NSDAP was formed). His *Myth of the 20th Century* discussed one particularly gnostic sect, the Cathars (Holy or Purified Ones), in great detail, but stopped short of offering a simplified version of the Cathar religion-philosophy as the new religion (or reinstated religion) of Germany.

It is my contention here that Alfred Rosenberg's *Myth of the 20th Century* is quintessentially a gnostic work which attempted to set the stage for subsequent works which would have taken Germany back in time to a stage in which a simplified, anti-Jewish religion was the common practice in the West among the common peoples. It was designed not as a final statement on the New Nordic Religion, but was to serve as a trial balloon, a precursor of what was to come. In the early 1920s Rosenberg was not prepared to offer a final statement of this philosophy. The research necessary to the full creation had not yet been completed. It was a promise of things to come. It was a quest which may, in his terms, be likened unto King Arthur's setting the Knights of the Round Table on the quest for the Holy Grail.

The Grail Legend

Every German schoolboy knew the great folk tale of the Grail

by heart. Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival* was one of the greatest works of literature in the German (or any other) language. On the surface it is a familiar tale of a pure knight's search for perfect love and redemption. It had been popularized in the late 19th Century by the composer Richard Wagner, in operatic form. Few pieces of heroic literature had more impact on the nation-conscious Germans than *Parzival*.

Wagner's opera opens with the aged Knight, Gurnemanz, recalling the legend of the Grail. Titurel had been fighting the pagans without success when, suddenly, he was visited by a band of angels. They gave unto his keeping the Holy Grail, which Christ drank from at the Last Supper; and the Spear of Longinius, the lance used by the Roman centurion to pierce the side of Jesus as he lay in agony upon the cross. Titurel had built a great stronghold at Monsalvat to house these treasures, and had gathered around him those knights who were pure in heart wherewith to guard these great talismans of heavenly power. These knights rode forth to fight injustice and tyranny throughout the world.

Klingsor was an applicant, but he could not vanquish lust and passion from his heart, and so was rejected for membership. He then built a great garden of evil in which, through enticements of the flesh provided by a variety of beautiful women, he lured the pure ones from their stronghold, and enslaved them in his evil service. Amfortas was sent forth by Titurel to carry the sacred lance into the evil place and end its temptations. Klingsor sent the lovely Kundry to tempt Amfortas. She seduced him and delivered the sacred spear to Klingsor. The evil sorcerer wounded Amfortas with it, and although Amfortas escaped, his wound would not heal. Amfortas believed that he was condemned for his sin of the flesh.

An Innocent Fool, Parsifal, appears on the scene, seeking his identity and destiny. After a brief scene in which the Holy Grail is unveiled, he goes to Klingsor's castle. Kundry is sent to seduce him, but, suddenly, Parsifal has a vision and is transfixed. He is told that should he fall to Kundry's seduction there can be no healing of Amfortas' wound and no salvation for him or the Grail Knights. He rejects Kundry and leaves. Klingsor attempts to kill him with the spear, but it hovers over the youth's head. The sensual paradise collapses and Klingsor vanishes.

After many years Parsifal returns from his wanderings throughout the world. He finds that Kundry has taken the robes of a penitent and that Gurnemanz has become a hermit. It is Good Friday. He is told that Titurel has died and that Amfortas still lies wounded and unable to consecrate Holy Communion. Parsifal goes to Monsalvat, touches Amfortas' wound with the sacred

spear and revives the knight. The spear and the Grail are replaced in the sanctuary.

The Grail legend is interpreted in two ways. Generally, it is viewed as a story of Christian love and the redemption of mankind. The second is the mythical interpretation. The Grail is said to contain a coded message known only to a few, and understood by a tiny number. It is this interpretation which is accepted by Ravenscroft in *The Cup of Destiny* (1981) and Angebert in *The Occult and the Third Reich* (1974).

Lucifer was a Prince of Heaven before his sin prompted God to cast him to Hell. On the descent to the Underworld his crown fell to earth, and from it a huge emerald. This was used by men of antiquity to fashion a drinking cup to be used in occult rituals. Here we find the most ancient relic accepted by both Christians and gnostics. The cup was ringed with the usual special signs, symbols, runes and the like, all depicting the ascent of man through various stages to a final state of blessedness. The Grail had become the sacred vessel of Initiate Knowledge. It contained on its exterior the great trove of primordial knowledge and tradition which linked the past to the future. That primordial knowledge can bring man back into the natural and only true condition for him, the primordial state of consciousness.

Within Germany many regarded the Grail as the lost, secret book of the Aryan race. It had been entrusted to them since eons past, and was lost and recovered on occasion. What precisely it contained was unknown, and since it was written in symbols, the interpretation given these runes may have differed from age to age. It was the one great treasure of all Aryans, at all times. From age to age it had been the uniting factor, the one artifact that provided a rationale for the existence of the race.

The recent movie *Excalibur* has given a similar highly secularized interpretation of the Grail myth. The Grail is presented as being a sort of intermediary between ruler and ruled, a magic transmitter that guarantees that the king and the land are one, and that each will serve the other in a wholly natural relationship. Yet it is the spiritual dimension of the Grail that allows for this mythical union.

The Grail predated Christianity. This is an absolute whose acceptance is necessary for understanding the importance of it as an artifact to the NSDAP and its leaders, notably the SS. In Alfred Rosenberg's *Myth of the 20th Century* the Grail may be viewed as the cause of German objection to some aspects of Christianity, notably to Roman Catholicism. It may be viewed as having provided direction to the German people, or at least a significant portion of it, when the people were confronted by orthodox Western church teachings which were alien to them.

While the authors of the recent studies, notably Angebert and Ravenscroft, and to a lesser degree Pauwels and Bergier, have noted the importance of the Cathars of the 11th through the 14th centuries, they have not gone far enough in their research. It is true, as we shall see below, that the "Pure Ones" did preserve, for a time, the Grail and other related artifacts, but they were relative latecomers, both doctrinally and in terms of interest in and preservation of the Grail.

The Marcionite Heresy

We must return to the 2nd century A.D., to Marcion of Sinope in Pontus, to see the development of the whole body of literature surrounding the Grail. The greater portion of what stood in contradistinction to both Western Catholicism and the later Orthodox schism from that Church, can be seen at least germinally in Marcion. He, like many, had struggled with the great problem of evil. The Church had not as of that time decided its own explanation of evil in the world. The question was far from settled when Marcion was writing.

The Marcionites believed that evil was a truly real force, not merely the privation of some good. One may, for simplification, regard that evil power as the Devil, Satan, or the Lord of the Flies. He is a power to be reckoned with. The world was the source of sin and corruption, and was to be avoided. It had been created just as the Old Testament had said, but not by God. There was a lesser being, or beings, much like the classic Greek "world artificers." Sometimes known as a Demiurge, that creator had a spark of divinity, for he was a son of God, an emanation from the Most High. Man naturally longs for his true home, but that is unknown to him. He is trapped in a world of corruption and ruination: in matter, the material world, which is not God's creation.

To Marcion, the Old Testament was lie because it was the story of a false god, a deceiver: Jehovah. It and most, if not all, of its various characters were a deceit, and must be rejected. The Jews he considered to be the people of Jehovah, that is, a race dedicated to the false god. He agreed with the Jews on one point: their messiah had not yet come. Jesus Christ was not their redeemer; he had come to liberate men from the false religion of Jehovah. In his anti-cosmic dualism, Marcion put the unknown God in opposition to the inferior creator-god, Jehovah. The salvation of mankind meant, in a word, liberation from Jehovah.

The contrast between the two worlds and their respective gods is very great. Jehovah is presented by Marcion as a warrior-avenger, interested in perpetuating a world of retribution. The

gentle Jesus is the agent of the unknown (alien) God, and he is merciful and filled with love. One cannot know the unknown (alien) God directly, and though he may have been suspected by men, he was not revealed to exist until Jesus came into the world. Jehovah was at home in the material world because it was his mirror image, made in his (not the alien-God's) image and likeness. The true God could not exist in this world, for he is pure spirit and is in direct opposition to the conflict and disorder which is inherent in matter.

The Marcionites rejected any and all things which tied one to the material world, or which seemed to tie one there, or which seemed to suggest physical redemption or conversion of material things. Thus they rejected baptism, except as a manifestation of their disdain for the material world. Holy Communion was a great contradiction, for it had as its primary content the transfixion of material things into the realm of the spirit and of the unknown God. All earthly pleasures were to be avoided as distractions which tie one to the temporal world. Sexual contact was another more serious tie to the visible world. Procreation of children meant that more sparks of the spirit were to be entrapped in the world of tears and deceit.

Because he is pure goodness and mercy, the unknown God adopted mankind, or at least that portion which was his own and to whom he could come, and who would accept and love him. God gave us grace quite freely to aid in our salvation, not because we as lowly beings could not merit it, but because he loved us although he did not know us. This is the doctrine of "pure grace," a quintessential part of Marcionite theology. That, in a sense, is the whole of the religion. God so loved the world that, although unknown to him, he chose to bring men to live with him so that he and men could come to know one another in a world far removed from the corruption of the present one.

Morality was not regarded as conformity to some law of Nature; nature was physical, and thus corrupt. God was not *in* the world. Natural laws were the embodiment of the demi-urge, Satan, not the Unknown God. One ought to avoid contact with nature in all its visible forms, for it leads one away from the true God.

While it is faith, not knowledge, that leads us toward God, we must have access to and know the special knowledge that much of what passes as religion is false. We must know, in Marcion's *schema*, that the Unknown God *is* God, and that the creator of the world is only an eon, an evil emanation from God. Christ the Son of God came to bring us to know that which we cannot know directly, in and of ourselves. That we are trapped in matter without hope of redemption unless we know the correct faith is a

matter of special, or gnostic, revelation. That God invites us strangers into his home without any knowledge of us, or we of him, is a canon of faith which can be known only through this special knowledge.

Marcion dropped elements of the New Testament that he did not like. What remained were expurgated portions of the Gospels (notably Luke), some of Paul's letters, and bits of the Acts of the Apostles. It is noteworthy that the Western church had not, as of this time, codified the New Testament. Marcion was more restrictive than most of the priests of the time in his choice of acceptable materials for the services. He rejected the Old Testament entirely, although one deviation of the time, possibly not Marcionite, devolved into snake worship, based on the Old Testament tale of the snake tempting Eve. Presumably, the snake was a good symbol for it was set in contradistinction to the ones Marcion had made evil characters. The snake was believed to be bringing certain knowledge of Satan, the creator of Adam and Eve.

In censoring the New Testament, Marcion excised those references made to an early childhood of Christ. Since Jesus was the messenger of the Most High, the Unknown God, he could not have been immersed in matter. Without having to materialize, Jesus had appeared to men to have a body and then only at Capernaum. He came to save those who would reject Judaism and Jehovah. What his precious blood purchased, in a metaphorical sense, was the freedom from the false god, Jehovah. He offered a baptism which would reject the world and all its material evils. One was to be "married" only to Christ so that child-bearing was avoided and man could escape the material world. While the material world would continue to exist, Christ had come to destroy, as an idea, the world of Jehovah.

The Manichaean Heresy

Few religious deviations in the Western church had greater impact or longer-lasting effect than Manichaeanism. Founded by Mani in Mesopotania about 242 A.D., it was a major rival to orthodox Christianity. Mani was martyred by the Western Church in 276 A.D. Among the early adherents was the great apologist for the Catholic Church, St. Augustine, who practiced its tenets from about 373 to 382. His *City of God* has strong Manichaean tendencies in its absolute dichotomy between good and evil, and between the city of man (visible world) and the City of God (realm of the spirit).

Mani reflected the gnostic background of the area and the times. The origin of evil lay in the nature of matter itself. Its

multiplicity is radically opposed to the spirituality of God. Matter is an evil which can never be redeemed; it is eternally evil. The soul is divine, or like unto the divine, for it is immaterial and simple. Man's body is but a prison in which the soul is entrapped. Redemption is found only in death.

The Demiurge, or lesser creator, created the visible world out of particles which belonged to the powers of darkness. These powers are opposed to God and the whole realm of the spirit. They are forever entrapped in the world of matter. They entice man to use his sexual powers to continually procreate so that bits of the spirit are trapped in the bodies of men. Otherwise the bodies would be lifeless, hollow shells, and there would be no one for the powers of darkness to control.

The dichotomy is called anti-cosmic dualism. It underlies all of the major works of gnosticism, but especially Manichaeanism. Sin is concomitant with life itself in the material world. Only the spark of life, the human spirit, is fit for godly action or thoughts, and for redemption. Necessarily this dualism concluded that whatever is merely finite (hence limited in time) is evil; whatever is eternal is good, and the spirit of man is a spark of the eternal fire of God.

Manichaeanism had a rigid ethic. Mankind was forbidden to kill animals or otherwise to shed blood. Sex was condemned for reasons noted above. One was to reject Satan, the world, all material things, and all happiness based on the enjoyment of material goods. The elect or perfects travelled begging for food. They ignored secular laws which were in any way antithetical to their religion, and openly sought martyrdom for their beliefs. A significant portion of the community was devoted to prayer and fasting, and was dependent on the lodging and hospitality of the common believers.

Strictly speaking, the Manichaeans were not Christians. They did accept Christ as having been a divine being, or, at least, a being who was guided by the Holy Spirit. But so too did they accept all of the major religious leaders: Buddha, Lao-tzu and others. They did reject the idea of incarnation that is the cornerstone of Christianity. Jesus only *appeared* to be a man. He was not hung on one cross; he was, at all times, omnipresent. Some of the critics of Manichaeanism accused the cult of pantheism. It is true that the Manichaeans had no special use for many of the Christian beliefs. They rejected Holy Communion on the ground that it was worthless because of the omnipresence of Jesus. They rejected the relics, such as the cross, partly because the artifacts were material and partly because they had no more relevance than any other physical item, since God was everywhere.

The term Manichaeanism has come to represent any and all varieties of dualism in which matter and spirit are necessarily and essentially opposed. The movement died out probably for two reasons. It was too anti-social in its rejection of sex and its exclusiveness. It went too far in rejecting war, violence and bloodshed in an age that was far too tempted to war in both conquest and defense. But the term and many of the ideas lingered on, the vital spark carried by others.

Agapius (c. 450 A.D.) attempted a fusion of Manichaeanism and true Christianity. He continued the belief in an Evil One, a self-subsistent force that is both eternal and opposed to God. He urged rejection of the whole of the Old Testament on the grounds that it was filled with lies and deceit. He, too, condemned earthly pleasures, sex included. Yet he believed in the doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, baptism for the remission of sins, the Crucifixion, Resurrection and Final Judgment, and the resurrection of the material and glorified body. His fusion, while intriguing, had only its role as a link in the time chain to commend it.

The Paulicans are quite another matter, for they served as a link between Manichaeanism and the Cathars, from about 668 A.D. when the cult was organized, until after 1200. In 869, Peter of Sicily wrote a blistering attack on the Paulicans in his *Historia Manichaeorum*.

The origins of Paulicanism are obscure. The teachings are traced by some authorities to Paul and John of Samosota. The name may have been derived from that Paul, or it may refer to the sect's devotion to ten letters of St. Paul (Saul). Others have traced it to an attempt to belittle the movement as the "petty disciples of Paul."

Publicly, the Paulicans rejected Manichaeanism, but privately they adopted the gnostic dualism and many other of its teachings. They rejected the Old Testament as a work of deception. They stated that it had been written by a race of thieves and deceivers, and was inspired by the worship of the false god, a demiurge, Jehovah. They hated the Jews on a second ground, as Christ judgers and condemners. They stopped short of condemning them as Christ killers because they viewed the Crucifixion as an illusion. They viewed Peter as a typical Jew who, under pressure and in danger, had betrayed Christ and denied him.

They attacked the traditional church on several grounds. They viewed clerical garb as the costume of Satan. They despised the emphasis placed on Christ's Passion and Crucifixion as these were either illusions or deliberate lies. Christ had no physical body made of the corrupt matter of this world. His "body" was an illusion offered to men as a convenient point of reference. Communion was an offering of material things, water or wine and

bread, and thus could not be holy. The true Eucharist, they taught, was in Christ's words and thoughts.

On the surface they appeared to be orthodox Christians, for they made a distinction between things done on the surface without meaning and those done privately with special meaning. The Bible, even the hated Old Testament, was accepted for esoteric use, while the initiates used esoteric rites in private. They believed that faith was the great guiding factor in attaining salvation (hence their love for Paul). But they also believed that there were certain hidden meanings and revealed words that the initiates must know in order to escape the material world. These they held in secret, in their clandestine services.

In one area they did differ from Manichaeanism. They were willing to fight and die. Much of their success came in opposing the armies of the Byzantine and, later, the Bulgarian empires. They spread the word with the sword as well as with the Bible. Perhaps their impact on history is greater because of their fighting prowess than because of their ideas. While they did not usually force conversion, the mere sight of their powerful armies in the field must have had a significant impact on the local population. Their power peaked under Tychicus, c. 801-835 A.D., although remnants remained active until at least 1200.

Paulican and Manichaean ideas were fused in an otherwise quite original movement which appeared in Bulgaria about 950 A.D. Our only true point of reference is a notation that they were first studied while Tsar Peter reigned in Bulgaria. Peter died in 969. The Bogomili were a group of initiates possessed of secret writings and ideas, whose name indicates "God have mercy" or "Mercy of God" or "Beloved of God."

Their highly original position in theology begins with the gnostic dualism of matter as evil and spirit as good. In the story of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32) they found an allegory. Christ is the good son who remained with the father and the devil is the son who goes off to do evil. The devil (*Satanel* as the Bogomili called him) was the son of God and the brother of Christ. One later tale which tells us of the Bogomili is as follows. The devil made the body of Adam. He tried to animate it with a spark of the eternal (soul) which he had stolen from God, but the soul would not remain in place. The soul continually exited through the anus. Eventually the devil was able to dam it up and the soul was sufficient to animate the body. The devil made the body from water and earth.

In a second version of the story the water flowed out of Adam's toe and formed a stream, which appeared to Adam as a snake. The snake tried to warn Adam of the deceit of Satanel, and was thus cursed by him. Eventually, God and his prodigal son reached

an accord: each would rule a part of man. God was to govern what had been stolen from him, the spirit of man; the devil would govern the body.

To prevent the end of mankind, and thus end Satanel's control over man through his body, the devil must continue the human race. He could accomplish that only by continually entrapping the spirit in matter. He thus uses sex as the primary instrument of control. Without sex and procreation there would be no future subjects for Satanel's control. Thus, marriage was to be rejected by the true believer.

The esoteric portion of the Bogomile cult taught that messages were hidden in the gospels, acts of the apostles, and letters of Paul. One had to have a certain key to unlock the secrets. For reasons that are not clear, but perhaps out of fear of the Jews, the messages were presented in riddles, allegories and metaphors. The correct interpretation of the materials was vital to salvation.

The Bogomili rejected the cross—it was a symbol of evil. On it the Jews had really or symbolically crucified Christ. Even if one attempts to reconcile the dualism which precludes Christ from having a body with the hatred of the Jews as "Christ killers" one is left with the idea in Bogomilism that they condemned Christ and his teaching. The Cross may be symbolically interpreted as representing that condemnation and rejection.

The Bogomili made no distinction between priests and laity. It was a democratically-run organization with no hierarchy until about 1200. They were more contemplative than the Paulicans, less given to action, and apparently non-violent. Had they been more active militarily their organizational structure may have been greater. They did not attempt to create a temporal regime.

The usual rejection of the sacraments marked Bogomilism. Marriage leads to continued creation of material bodies. Communion is an attempt to do the impossible: sanctify matter which is evil and *cannot* be blessed. Relics are rejected, and formal churches for the same reason.

The Phundagiagitae may be regarded as a form or application of Bogomilism and, to a degree, Paulicanism. It was probably founded by John Tzurillas in Bulgaria about 1050, and spread through Bulgaria and Byzantium. It was more willing than the Bogomili to pay lip service to those things of organized Orthodox Christianity. Its adherents were hard to discover during the many persecutions of non-Orthodox Christians in both Bulgaria and Byzantium.

The Phundagiagitae were accused of being devil worshipers, and of having a developed satanology. The accusation comes from a misreading of their interest in Satanel as a son of God

and as the creator of this world. God created six heavens, and Satanel the remaining one. Satanel had tricked the other devils into rebelling against God; realizing that they had been tricked, these other fallen angels set about to create a race of helpers for mankind. This they did by fathering a race of giants by the daughters of men.

Moses had led the Jews astray, the Phundagiagitae argued, by worshiping only Satanel, and in offering men the law which was written by Satanel, not by God. Other men rebelled, urged on by the giants who had been instructed by their fathers. In retaliation, Satanel caused the Universal Deluge which killed all but Noah who had remained loyal to him. In this cult, very few of the Old Testament figures were worthy of other than eternal damnation.

Satanel had stolen the spark from God which became the spirit of man. This was represented metaphorically as the light of the sun set against the eternal darkness of Satanel's realm. The spirit of man cried out for redemption so God sent his son Jesus Christ to the rescue. After having saved men, or that portion to whom he came and who received him, Jesus returned to heaven. On the ascent he bound Satanel, and removed from him his godliness, after which the devil became Satan, the "el" having been appropriately dropped. (The "el" indicated "of God.") The teaching of Jesus was designed exclusively to liberate men from Satanel and his servants on earth, the Jews, followers of Moses and Noah.

The Pure Ones

In the *Myth of the 20th Century* Alfred Rosenberg spends much time discussing the Cathars, also known as the Albigensians or Pure Ones. He clearly preferred their brand of Christianity to the Roman Catholic version. They were the carriers of the Manichaean tradition, as influenced by the Bogomili, Paulicans and others, into Central Europe, in the years prior to the Reformation. Had the Cathars been more militarily active and adept it is they, not Luther and Calvin, who might have won a place in history as the reformers of Christianity and the successful rebels against the Church. As it was, they were successfully contained by the Catholic Church and allied princes.

We find the Cathars emerging by about 1025 A.D., in Germany, Italy and France, also spreading to England and Flanders. Originally they were simply "the new Manichaeans," and were so labeled by those whom the Church sent to weed out the recurrent heresy. There are many legends about the founders of the Cathar heresy, but no single figure or small, identifiable group can be credited. Gerbert of Aurillac, Archbishop of Reims, for example,

in 991 made a declaration of principles which were decidedly gnostic and Manichaean, but he cannot be said to have led or encouraged the spread of Cathar religion. In 1028 William V, Duke of Aquitaine, summoned a council of bishops to deal with the heresy, and there it was held that it had spread northward from Italy. Ademar of Chabannes believed that a woman and another peasant had carried the doctrine into France, perhaps from Italy. Modern scholarship suggests that a portion of it, at least, came from Bulgaria, Armenia, and/or the Byzantine Empire, with another portion coming out of the Moslem Empire, where there was an unusual tolerance for strange gnostic sects.

Their doctrines are learned by and large from Roman Catholic sources, mostly records kept of the inquisition of prisoners. No book similar to the (ancient Armenian?) *Key to Truth* had to date been discovered, translated and disseminated to explain the Cathar side of the controversy over their doctrines. Most modern scholarship begins with a stern warning that the records of the Inquisition, even if accurate, were gleaned from those under torture, and thus those questioned were prone to say what the torturer wished to hear. Also, the records were obtained from unlearned peasants whose ideas of theology contradict one another, and none may be accurate in their recountings of the theology. Last, we must note that the Cathar heresy existed clearly for more than two centuries and it had no central authority similar to the papacy to set doctrine universally.

The Cathars were clearly dualists in the classical Manichaean sense. The earliest references to them state that there was a new outbreak of the Church's old nemesis, Manichaeanism. Intermittently thereafter the Cathars were called Manichaean. Authorities have not decided, based on the available testimony, whether the Cathar dualism was of traditionally opposed eternal gods, or whether it was of the monarchical type. There may have been shades of each heresy existing simultaneously. The monarchical dualism suggests that the power of evil is a being in all ways inferior to God, and that evil force will disappear when the material world ends. Traditional dualism, based in some part on the teachings of the Persian sage Zarathustra (Zoroaster) suggests that there are two equally eternal and powerful beings, one good and one evil.

The Cathars accepted the usual limited scriptural writings, and excluded the bulk of the Old Testament. Several books, to which the New Testament referred often, were retained, notably the Psalms. Jehovah of the Jews was dismissed as being either an incarnation or form of Satan, or as being merely a world artificer and not God. They gave esoteric interpretations to Scripture, including proscription of eating meat. The portions of the New

Testament which did not suit their purposes were removed, usually with the justification that these had been added by the Jews to confuse or confound the faithful.

There was a significant distinction made between the Perfects and the laity within Catharism. The laity were those who were learning the true Christianity. They could marry, or continue to live in wedlock, if they wished. The initiates who had taken the final vows of the cult could not have sexual intercourse or live in a family environment. The training period often lasted several years or even a decade or more. Many Cathars held off taking the vows until they were near death, so that they were not obliged to follow the much stricter moral code required of the Perfects.

The great sacrament of the Cathar religion was the Consolamentum. It was held in the home of a Perfect or a symphathizer. It began with a communal confession of sins and failures called the Servitium. All those present, Perfects or followers, participated. A senior Perfect held aloft a copy of the excised Scripture. The transcriptions of what the ceremony consisted of have come down to us, and as reported contain nothing that is shocking to, or antithetical to, orthodox Christianity. The closest it came to heresy was the stress laid on the sins one could commit of a material type, notably the sins of the flesh.

The candidate's initiation into the final rite of the Perfects was reasonably simple. It was flavored with writings from the accepted Church fathers and the excised Scripture, but mostly consisted of the rejection of things which were offensive to the Cathars. One pledged not to eat meat, engage in worldly vanities, lie, cheat, swear, and the like. The Roman Catholic Church alleged that it was at this point that the rejection of all things Catholic took place. The cathechumen was reminded that here, before God, he swore eternal allegiance to his religion. Doubtless, he was required to renounce the Sacraments, since these were tied to the material world, and several canons of faith.

The Cathars drank no wine, and they objected to Holy Communion on the ground that nothing material could be made holy or purified in the sight of God. This, as we have seen before, is standard in anti-cosmic and gnostic dualism. Confession was an open affair, and not made to the priesthood. The cross was most objectionable, on the traditional ground that it was the symbol of the passion, even though they generally believed that Christ had no body and only appeared to suffer. The fact that the Jews had sought to crucify and condemn Jesus was sufficient reason to hate the cross, even if Christ was not actually crucified.

Some Cathars appeared to be Adoptionists. Here, they believed that a man like any of us—but a non-Jew—had been born, out of the flesh of Mary, fathered probably by Joseph, but not born of a

virgin, and not born of one eternally exempted from sin (Immaculate Conception). At the time of the baptism by John, when God spoke the words "This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased," Jesus was transfixed or possessed by God. The "adoption" remained through the crucifixion, and possibly God removed himself from the man either at the Garden of Gethsemane or on the cross ("My God! My God! Why hast thou forsaken me?"). Most among those accepting Adoptionism believed that the man, not the man-God, was crucified.

Probably the mainstream Cathars believed that God had not, and could not, become flesh, because flesh is material and thus corrupt. He only appeared to men to have a body, as a convenience to men to see him. That point of view had a secondary benefit: it precluded having to be concerned with whether Christ was a Jew. That was a problem of some considerable concern for a group which had fully rejected Judaism and the writings, prophets, thoughts, and laws of the Old Testament.

Traditional teachings on Heaven, Hell and Purgatory were unacceptable to the Cathars. Earth, as the material world of the Devil and of corruption, was the Hell. Only those who renounced the flesh and Satan could be assumed into Heaven. The Consolamentum was the purgation of the evil and corruption from man. Thus, there was no need for a second place in which this cleansing could occur. Likewise, there was no need to pray for the dead. Some of the dead had made it to the Heaven above the corruption of the material world, and thus needed no help. Others continued to have their spirits entrapped in the world.

None of the works consulted on Catharism have taken up the question of reincarnation, but it seems to be a logical consequence of the religion. If a soul was not able to escape matter, would it not be forced to return to try again? Or was it that a soul which failed to rise from the material world in that single attempt of the lifetime spent here was eternally trapped in matter in some way? The sources we have are silent on this important point.

One might also ask if it was necessary for the Cathars to believe that *all* men had this spark of the Eternal God. This is not taken up in the extant sources either. One legend suggested that Satan invaded the celestial abode sufficiently well enough to capture one-third of the spirits and these he entrapped in earthly bodies. However, the legend does not state clearly that this number was sufficient to account for all mankind. This, precisely, is the major problem in the Cathar teachings: they spoke in myths, parables and legends, and not infrequently contradicted themselves.

Except in a highly symbolic sense, Mary had no role in the Cathar teachings. Some held that she was, as a virgin, a symbol

for the Church in its most abstract form. One sidelight held that Mary was a vehicle through which an eon passed on its way to earth; and a variance allowed Christ to have passed through her, but through her ear, not through the usual birth route.

The Inquisition accused the Cathars of being pantheists. In a spiritual sense, something of God may be said to be present in all things. Conversely, nothing material could house God, as in the Cathar rejection of Holy Communion, because God was the antithesis of materialist diversity and multiplicity. The Cathars generally responded to questions about God's presence in Church or in Communion by saying that God was no more present there than anywhere else. Some Cathars evidently believed that God, being all-powerful, could enter matter, or take on the appearance of matter, at will, to deceive the Devil and rescue the Men of Light from their material prison. Thus, at any given time, God may be present in any apparently material thing, or appear to all, Satan included, as a material thing.

The list of figures inverted in their moral standing is both long and intriguing. Jehovah, as we have seen, was as the Jewish God both evil and a false god, a form of Satan (or Satan incarnate). Abraham and Moses were said to have been inspired by the Devil. John the Baptist was evil because he baptised in water (i.e., a material thing) instead of baptising in the spirit. The various characters who destroyed, or who had a hand in destroying, others—as in the robbery of the Caananites to obtain the "land of milk and honey"—were condemned.

Rosenberg and Gnosticism

The Cathars served as a highly convenient take-off point for Alfred Rosenberg's attack on both the Catholic Church and on Judaism. It is impossible to show his intellectual development, to say whether his disdain for these two powerful institutions flowed from a general dislike of them, or from his analysis of their doctrine or their history. However, there are many references throughout the *Myth of the 20th Century* to both groups as the corrupters of Christianity and of God's true message, and to these organizations as the persecutors of the Cathars.

One may assume that Rosenberg's constant favorable reference to the Cathars suggests that he believed they possessed the key to true Christianity. Rosenberg insisted throughout his writings and speeches that he was a Christian. He criticized the Roman Church on the usual grounds that one finds throughout post-Reformation Europe. But there was much more to it than that. The Reformation had not gone far enough. Luther and Calvin, and others, had started in the right direction, but had faltered.

One might compare the Protestants to the Waldenses who were the contemporaries of the Cathars. The Waldenses were in no way dogmatic and they spent very little time with questions of esoteric doctrine. They merely wanted to purify the Church, simplify the services, and end the corruption among the clergy. In short, they wanted to reform the Church to conform more to the "simple" Church they believed to have existed during the Acts of the Apostles. These, basically, were the aims and the results of Protestantism. In "simplifying" they wanted to reduce the number and complexity of the sacraments and the stronghold of central authority over matters of faith, morals, and bureaucracy. The doctrinal disputes were minimal, and for the most part no more comprehensible that the difference between Catholic Transubstantiation and Lutheran Consubstantiation. The doctrinal differences were of very little concern to most of the body of the faithful.

Thus, Luther paid great heed to the literal interpretation of the whole of the Bible, and rejected tendencies (latent Catharism?) to excise the Old Testament. The matter of a vernacular Bible was more important than any process of "purifying" the content. The Calvinists paid even greater attention to the Old Testament than did the Catholic Church. The Puritan form even attempted to reinstitute the Rule of Judges and the Old Testament theocracy when they came to power in New England, and many of the True Levellers ("Diggers") attempted to do the same in England.

Luther had the greatest reverence for the literal word of Paul. The Cathars and other gnostics had made great use of Paul, but in a way so highly symbolic that a fair statement of the situation might be that they merely used Paul as a take-off point for their esoteric ideas. It is with Paul, especially a literal interpretation of Paul, that Rosenberg had his greatest problem with Christianity. Rosenberg saw in Paul a conclusive hypocrisy, in that Paul denied the Law, yet paid great attention to the development of the same Law. He had rejected the Mosaic Code under that name as too binding, but had attempted to codify a Law for Christians which, Rosenberg said, was merely the Mosaic Code under a new name.

To Rosenberg, Paul was the grand conspirator. Seeing that the new religion of Christ could not be defeated, that it threatened Judaism, the Jews sent Paul to transform it. Because the New Testament blamed the Jews for the death of Christ ("His blood be upon us. . . . ") it would or at least could take on an anti-Jewish character. So the Jews decided, according to Rosenberg, to send one of their own, in effect sacrificing him, to redirect Christianity. It was this simple: Christ had come unto his own, and his own received him not. The Jews were thus outcast. But by redirecting Christianity, Paul made it seem that the Jews were not outcasts.

Had it not been for Paul, Rosenberg argued, Christianity would have been as the "heretics" like the Bogomili, Manichaeans, Paulicans, or Cathars. It would have rejected the Old Testament, removed the Jews and their Jehovah, and founded an anti-Jewish religion.

We are unusually hard-pressed to discover precisely how much of the gnostic anti-cosmic dualistic theology Rosenberg had mastered. We do not know precisely what books he read or discovered. Neither do we know precisely what the "Occult Bureau" of the SS had found.

After the fall of the last Cathar stronghold, in October 1244 A.D. at Montsegur, a few of the group made it through the Roman Catholic lines and carried off the treasures. Among these was reputed to be a Holy Grail, and on it the initiate knowledge the Cathar gnosticism required for salvation. This is the great theme of both Ravenscroft's books, and of Angebert's *The Occult and the Third Reich*. Otto Rahn's *Crusade Against the Grail*, published during the pre-war years, suggests that the location of the greatest of the Cathar treasures was known. Possibly, too, the SS had located long lost books of Cathar theology, or books showing the esoteric Cathar interpretation of the New Testament books they accepted. Also, the SS may have located the Cathar commentaries on books long used by Manichaean sects, including apocryphal books like The Books of Enoch, the Book of Adam and Eve, The Gospel of Thomas, or The Childhood of Jesus.

Ravenscroft believed that the spear of Longinius had long before been located, in Vienna, at the treasure-house of the hereditary Austrian kings. The spear, as he calls it in his book title: *The Spear of Destiny*, was to Ravenscroft a talisman of power in and of itself. He suggested, but did not clearly state, that it may be much more.

We may be puzzled, as an aside, by the movie *Raiders of the Lost Ark*. In a sense, it suggests that a small group knew that the National Socialists were hunting for certain symbols, such as the Holy Grail and the Spear of Longinius. In another sense, why was the Ark of the Covenant chosen in that movie? Nothing I have read about Rosenberg or the gnostics suggests that the Ark was remotely of interest.

Other than the miscellaneous writings we have suggested here, and the Grail, of what did the Cathar treasure consist? More to the point in this section of the essay, of what did Rosenberg believe it would consist? And what of that lot did Rosenberg study and consider? Presumably, Ravenscroft and Angebert, in researching their books, spent much time in considering answers to these questions. Both agree that Hitler and the National Socialists possessed the Spear. Neither author is evidently willing to

commit to the Nazis' possession any other specific object or writing. One might even ask if, indeed, the Cathars had a treasure, and, if they did, if *any* of it has survived.

I strongly suspect that somewhere there exists, or did exist at the end of the war, a substantial amount of very important research on the whole of the Cathar movement and the presumed great treasure taken from Montsegur. It would have been gathered for the express purpose of being made into the basis of the Nordic Christianity that preoccupied both Rosenberg and Hitler. Angebert's *The Occult and the Third Reich* suggests that a substantial portion of what the SS gathered on religion was put into use by the SS under Heinrich Himmler and that a special stronghold had been provided Himmler for the express purpose of indoctrinating his select SS leaders in the new cult. Pauwels and Bergier, whose work is most noteworthy for its wild statements given with absolutely no documentation, say in the *Morning of the Magician* that a whole black ritual devoted to Satan worship was offered selected SS officers. The Black Order was to be devoted to black magic, demonology and all sorts of evil things. Ravenscroft believed that Hitler was a black magician and a master of many of the occult sciences.

One might point out that similar charges had been brought against the Cathars. They had offered a whole new interpretation of Christianity and had suffered burning at the stake and other painful martyrdoms. Until the documents which still may exist are released, we can only say that it is within the context of Rosenberg's published works that he studied what was available on the Cathars, and perhaps other medieval Manichaeans (in a very broad definition of Manichaeanism), and that the ideas as he understood them were to be the basis for a reconstituted Christianity.

It is noteworthy that the Roman Catholic Church acted swiftly, and for the first time in many centuries attacked a specific work, Rosenberg's *Myth of the 20th Century*, in an encyclical entitled *Mit Brennender Sorge*. The issuance of an encyclical in the vernacular (German here) was itself more than slightly irregular and noteworthy. The Roman Catholic Church has also taken the position of exonerating the Jews for especial guilt in the death of Christ, placing the blame more universally on all men. That action has taken place since the *Myth of the 20th Century* was written and, to some considerable degree, the encyclical may be viewed as a reaction to Rosenberg and the National Socialist position.

Surely, nothing fitted in better with the prevailing thinking of the Third Reich than the Manichaean position on the Jews and the Old Testament. That it was quite possible to be anti-Jewish

and a good Christian at the same time was a cornerstone of the Nordic approach to Christian doctrine. It was also important that the medieval Manichaeans could allow that there was a race of cosmic men who were corrupt and materialistic and ruled by a false, materialistic god that stood in opposition to a race of pure men, steeped in rejection of the material world and deeply immersed in the realm of the spark of the Creator. The statement of the medieval Manichaeans on the race and the anti-race sounds like a passage plucked from the Nazi Primer.

Bibliographic Essay

Probably the best single-volume introduction to the various "heresies" is Steven Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee* (Cambridge, 1955). It gives a simplified overview and a reasonable statement of the times. E. Broeckx's *Le Catharisme* (Hoogstraten, 1916) is an excellent source on this particular religion. Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (Beacon, 1963) is an excellent coverage of all the major Manichaean religions and gnosticism generally. Dmitri Obolensky, *The Bogomils* (Cambridge, 1948) is authoritative on its subject. F.C. Conybeare discovered and translated an intriguing book based in Manichaean doctrine, *The Key of Truth* (Oxford, 1898). The book is as yet undated, but is clearly quite ancient. Modern authors disagree with Conybeare's introduction. F. Cumont's *Recherches sur le manicheisme* (Paris, 1908) is another excellent source on the subject. J. Guiraud has written an excellent *Histoire de l'inquisition au moyen age* (Paris, 1935-38). A. Borst's *Die Katharer* is one of the few works in German published since the war (Stuttgart, 1953). Recent and quite good is H. Soderberg, *La Religion des Cathars* (Uppsala, 1949). An old standard is C. Schmidt's *Histoire des Cathars et Albigeois* (Paris, 1849). On Rosenberg, I used the only English language edition, published in 1982 by Noontide Press, of *The Myth of the 20th Century*, while checking the original German text. A summary of Rosenberg's other works can be found in my *The Social, Political and Religious Thought of Alfred Rosenberg* (University Press of America, 1982).

The other books noted are: Trevor Ravenscroft, *The Cup of Destiny* (York Beach, Maine: Weiser, 1982) and *The Spear of Destiny* (New York: Putnam, 1973); Jean-Michel Angebert, *The Occult and the Third Reich* (New York: MacMillan, 1974); and Louis Pauwels and Jacques Bergier, *Morning of the Magician* (Paris: Gallimard, 1960).

On the Parsifal legend, one good edition is Jessie L. Weston, editor, *Parzival: A Knightly Legend by Wolfram von Eschenbach*, 2 volumes (London: Nutt, 1894). One might also see Helen M. Mustard and Charles E. Passage, *Parzival: A Romance of the Middle Ages* (New York: Vintage, 1961).

There has been a new wave of interest in the Cathars shown in France. Among the more interesting, but not necessarily always scientific, studies are: Pierre Durban, *Actualite du catharisme* (Toulouse: Bible d'or, 1968); Simone Hannedouche, *Manicheisme et catharisme* (Cahiers d'etudes cathares, 1967); Serge Hutin, *Les gnostiques* (Paris: P.U.F., 1958) and *Les societes secretes* (Paris: P.U.F., 1952); Rene Nelli, *Le phenomene cathare* (Toulouse: Privat, 1964), *Le musee du catharisme* (Toulouse: Privat, 1966) and *Ecritures cathares* (Paris: Planete, 1968); Fernand Niel, *Albigois et cathares* (Paris: P.U.F., 1965) and *Montsegur, la montagne inspiree* (Grenoble: Allier, 1967); S. Petrement, *Le dualisme chez Platon: les gnostiques et les manichees* (Paris: P.U.F., 1947); Henri-Charles Peuch, *Le manicheisme* (Paris: S.A.E.P., 1949) and *La quete du Graal* (Paris: Stock, 1934); Edouard Schure, *Les grands inities* (Paris: L.A.P., 1960); Gerard de Sede, *Le tresor cathare* (Paris: Julliard, 1966); and Christine Thouzellier, *Catharisme et valdeisme en Languedoc a la fin du XIIe et au debut XIIIe siecle* (Paris: P.U.F., 1967).

Otto Rahn's story of the initial search for the Grail is told in his *La Croisade contre la Graal* (Paris: Stock, 1934).

p. 343, 345, 346, 349, 350, 353

REVIEW ARTICLE

Yehuda Bauer and the 'Polemical and Apologetic Bias' of Jewish Historiography

L.A. ROLLINS

A HISTORY OF THE HOLOCAUST by Yehuda Bauer. New York: Franklin Watts, 1982, 398pp, $15.95, ISBN 0-531-098621

Hannah Arendt once pointed out the "strong polemical and apologetic bias" of Jewish historiography. Yehuda Bauer is Professor of Holocaust Studies at Jerusalem's Hebrew University. And, according to Dr. Franklin H. Littell, Bauer is "one of the world's top authorities on the Holocaust." But *A History of the Holocaust*, Yehuda Bauer's latest contribution to Jewish historiography, is no exception to Hannah Arendt's observation.

The book begins with a fairly lengthy overview of Jewish history. (We do not even reach the beginning of the Third Reich until page 93.) Bauer's bias is already apparent by page 4, where he tells us:

> In the ancient world, as well as later, the concept of one God meant that all humans were His children—that all men are equal, a revolutionary idea indeed.
>
> The laws that bear the imprint of the Mosaic tradition include the provision of liberating slaves after seven years (Ex. 21:2), of freeing all slaves who are maltreated (Ex. 21:26-27), of equality before the law (Ex. 21:20, 23-25), of the prohibition of murder and theft, and of the absolute sanctity of human life—all ideas or concepts logically connected to the idea of monotheism.

Thus does Bauer expound what Hannah Arendt called the "self-deceiving theory" of Jewish historians that "Judaism had always been superior to other religions in that it believed in human

equality and tolerance." But while the concept of one God might be taken to mean that all humans are His children and, therefore, are all brothers, it does not necessarily mean that all men are equal. Logically, the idea that two people, or all people, have the same father, or Father, simply does not imply that those people are therefore equal. And as a matter of fact, the idea of one God did not mean to the Israelites that all men were equal. Somewhat more accurately than Bauer, Joan Comay writes, "The concept of the covenant between God and his chosen people implied that all Israelites were equal in God's eyes, and that the human dignity and welfare of each had to be safeguarded." (*The World's Greatest Story*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 220-221.) That Israelites (God's chosen people) and non-Israelites were not considered to be equal or entitled to equal treatment is easily demonstrated. For one thing, the liberation of slaves after seven years, which Bauer mentions, applied only to Israelite slaves. As Milton Meltzer admits:

> The Hebrew code assigned the full condition of slavery to "the heathen that are round about you, of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids." And for them there was no prospect of liberation: "They shall be your bondmen forever." (*Slavery: From the Rise of Western Civilization to Today*, Laurel-Leaf Library, pp33-34. Meltzer quoted Leviticus 25:44, 46.)

The Mosaic code similarly discriminates between Israelite and non-Israelite in prohibiting usury.

> Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury.
>
> Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury. . . . (Deuteronomy 23:19-20.)

And the provision for periodically releasing debtors from indebtedness likewise discriminates between Israelite and non-Israelite.

> At the end of *every* seven years thou shalt make a release.
>
> And this *is* the manner of the release: Every creditor that lendeth *ought* unto his neighbour shall release *it*; he shall not exact *it* of his neighbour, or of his brother, because it is called the LORD's release.
>
> Of a foreigner thou mayest exact it *again*: but *that* which is thine with thy brother thine hand shall release. . . . (Deuteronomy 15: 1-3.)

Thus, Yehuda Bauer's claim that monotheism implies egalitarianism is merely pious balderdash.

Bauer also claims (p4) that, "The laws that bear the imprint of the Mosaic tradition include the provision . . . of the prohibition of murder and theft, and of the absolute sanctity of human life . . . . " The absolute sanctity of human life? Because the Mosaic code prohibits murder? But, of course, the Mosaic law also prescribes the death penalty for murder. Is killing a murderer consistent with "the absolute sanctity of human life?" In any case, consider some of the other capital crimes under the Mosaic law: smiting either of one's parents (Exodus 21:15), cursing either of one's parents (Exodus 21:17), bestiality (Exodus 22:19), sacrificing to any god other than "the Lord" (Exodus 22:20), adultery (Leviticus 20:10), incest (Leviticus 20:11-12), homosexual acts (Leviticus 20:13), having a familiar spirit (Leviticus 20:27), blaspheming the name of "the Lord" (Leviticus 24:16), working on "the Sabbath"—at this very moment *I* am working on "the Sabbath"—(Numbers 15:32-36), serving gods other than "the Lord" (Deuteronomy 13:12-18), saying "Let us go serve other gods" (Deuteronomy 13:6-10), and being a rebellious or stubborn son (Deuteronomy 21:18-21). If "the laws that bear the imprint of the Mosaic tradition include the provision of . . . the absolute sanctity of human life," then Yehuda Bauer is a ham sandwich. (Incidentally, a few pages later, on page 10, Bauer asserts that "the Jews" had ". . . elevated the sanctity of human life to a near absolute. . . . " Thus, between pages 4 and 10 Bauer reduces "the absolute sanctity of human life" to merely a near absolute. A very slight concession to reality by Yehuda Bauer.)

Another manifestation of the "polemical and apologetic bias" of Yehuda Bauer's Jewish historiography is his expurgated version of Messianism. According to Bauer (p15), ". . . in Jewish belief, the Messiah would come to lead the Jews back to their ancestral home in Israel and thus end their troubles and wanderings." But is this really all there was (is?) to the Messiah myth? Not according to Jewish anthropologist Raphael Patai and the Jewish writings he has brought together in his book *The Messiah Texts* (Avon). For example, Patai mentions (p xxxvii) ". . . the global upheaval and havoc [the Messiah] was expected to wreak among the Gentiles. . . . " Patai also mentions (p189) ". . . the time of triumph, in which all the nations of the world recognize him as their spiritual leader and ruler, and he becomes a veritable *pantocrator*, world ruler—always, of course, in his capacity as the faithful servant of God." On page 193 Patai quotes from pages 162 a-b of *Pesiqta Rabbati*:

> "In that hour [in which King Messiah reveals himself] the Holy One, blessed be He, lets shine the light of the Messiah and of Israel, and all of the nations of the world will be in darkness and

> blackness, and all will walk in the light of the Messiah and of Israel . . . and they will come and lick the dust under the feet of King Messiah. . . . And all will come and fall upon their faces before the Messiah and before Israel, and will say to him: "Let us be servants to you and to Israel!" And each one of Israel will have 2,800 servants. . . .

According to Isaiah 49:22-23, the Gentiles would also lick the dust under the feet of "Israel," that is, the Jews. As Patai explains (p xxxvii):

> Living as they did in a state of dispersion among the nations and of oppression by the Gentiles, the Jews nevertheless remained firmly convinced of the centrality of the Jewish people in the divine scheme with all this meant in imaginary privileges and onerous obligations. Thus the Redemption in the End of Days, too, could not but be centered on the Jewish people, whose role, however, was conceived as that of divine instrument in imposing God's rule over the entire world.

Along the same lines, Patai also says (p xxvi), "For many centuries, in the midst of persecutions, massacres, expulsions, and humiliations, while living the life of hated and despised pariahs, the Jews in their fantasy saw themselves as kings of the World to Come, enjoying great pleasures of the palate, exquisite luxuries of housing and clothing, wading ankle-deep in floods of diamonds and pearls, studying the new Tora of the Messiah taught to them directly by God, and being entertained by dances performed by God himself to the music of angels and the heavenly spheres."

Yehuda Bauer gives not the slightest hint of the Messiah as "world ruler," of the Jewish people as "divine instrument in imposing God's rule over the whole world," of all the Gentile nations of the world coming to Jerusalem to lick the dust from the feet of the Messiah and "Israel" (the Jews), or of each Jew having 2,800 Gentile servants. Of course, if Bauer had mentioned these amazing ingredients of Messianism, then he wouldn't have been able to blithely dismiss the idea of "a Jewish desire to control the world" as nothing but a "false myth" (p45). But Bauer is not willing to admit even the possibility that some Jews might desire to control the world. And so he disingenuously attributes the idea of a Jewish desire to control the world to the "Satanic image" of "the Jew." "Just as Satan is out to control the world, so the Jew, possessed by the Devil, must be." (p44) But *I* do not see "the Jew" as possessed by "the Devil," yet it seems entirely plausible to me that some Jews might well wish to control the world. As Mark Twain said, "The Jews are members of the human race—worse I can say of no man." Jews are human beings. And some human beings desire power over others. And for some human beings the

lust for power is so all-consuming that they actually desire to control the world. For example, Cecil Rhodes. (See *The Anglo-American Establishment* by Carroll Quigley, Books in Focus.) I see no reason for ignoring the evidence to the contrary and assuming that Jews are inherently incapable of such a lust for power.

But in Yehuda Bauer's biased world-view, it is only Gentiles who are capable of lusting for world power. While Bauer dismisses the idea of a Jewish desire to control the world as a "false myth," he approvingly quotes (p84) Robert Payne's characterization of *Mein Kampf* as ". . . a blueprint for the total destruction of bourgeois society and the conquest of the world. . . . " As a matter of fact, there were a few passages in *Mein Kampf* that envisioned, in the distant future, a world ruled by an "Aryan" master race. See pages 383-384 of the Sentry edition, for example. But, contrary to the "false myth" perpetuated by Robert Payne and Yehuda Bauer, there was no blueprint, no detailed plan for world conquest.

Bauer finally gets down to the real nitty-gritty in his ninth chapter, "The 'Final Solution.' " He begins by discussing (p193) the various conditions which supposedly led to a decision to kill all European Jews. But then he says the crucial factor "was the desire to murder the Jews inherent in Nazi antisemitism." Amazingly, however, "Up until early 1941, the Nazis—with the possible exception of Hitler himself—were not conscious of the murderous ingredient of their own ideology because the practical possibilities of implementing it were not apparent." So the Nazis really wanted to kill the Jews all along; they just didn't realize that they wanted to kill them until early 1941 when it became possible to do so. Does Yehuda Bauer really expect anyone to take this quasi-Freudian humbuggery seriously?

In any case, like his fellow "authorities on the Holocaust," Bauer does not prove, but merely assumes, that Hitler, at some indefinite date, gave an order to Himmler "to destroy European Jewry." Bauer says (p194), "Himmler himself hinted at such an order in various communications." Among such communications which Bauer cites in a footnote on page 362 is Himmler's circular memorandum of 9 October 1942. Here is Bauer's version of that memorandum:

> After executing the less useful Jews, the remaining Jews, who were to become laborers, were to be sent to concentration camps "in the eastern part of the General Gouvernement [German-occupied central Poland], if possible. Even from there, however, the Jews are someday to disappear, in accordance with the Fuehrer's wishes."

But here is the full text of the memorandum, as translated into English by Elizabeth Wiskemann on pages 110-111 of *Anatomy of the SS State* by Helmut Krausnick *et al.* (Walker and Company):

> 1. I have issued instructions that all so-called armament workers employed merely in boot and shoe factories, timber yards and clothing workshops in Warsaw and Lublin will be removed under the direction of *SS-Obergruppenfuehrer* Krueger and *SS-Obergruppenfuehrer* Pohl to concentration camps. The *Wehrmacht* should transfer any orders outstanding to us and we will guarantee delivery of the clothing required. I have also ordered that steps be ruthlessly taken against all those who think they can use the interests of the war industry to cloak their real intention to protect the Jews and their own business affairs.
>
> 2. Jews who are directly employed in the war industry—that is to say, in armament or vehicle workshops and so forth—are to be released gradually. As a first step they are to be assembled on one floor of the factory. Subsequently all the hands on this floor are to be transferred—on an exchange basis if possible—to a "secure" undertaking, so that all we shall have in the Government General will be a number of "secure" concentration camp undertakings.
>
> 3. Our next endeavour will be to replace this Jewish labour force with Poles and to amalgamate the great majority of the Jewish concentration camp enterprises with one or two large, not wholly Jewish, concentration camp undertakings—if possible in the eastern part of the Government General. In due course these will also be cleared of Jews in accordance with the wishes of the Fuehrer.

As you can see, Himmler's memorandum said nothing about "executing the less useful Jews." Nor did it say "the remaining Jews . . . were to become laborers." The memorandum dealt exclusively with Jews who already were laborers. As for the final statement of the memorandum, that eventually the concentration camps would be "cleared of Jews in accordance with the wishes of the Fuehrer," this could have been a hint at a Hitler order for the destruction of European Jewry only if there *was* such an order. But, as I've said, Bauer never proves, he merely *assumes* there was such an order.

Bauer's chapter on "the Final Solution," like the other chapters of his book, is replete with assertions for which he cites no supporting source(s). For example, after discussing *Einsatzgruppen* massacres in Russia, Bauer asserts (p200), "Mass killings also occurred in Odessa in the Crimea, at Rumanian hands, where 144,000 civilians were murdered, largely by drowning." Since this struck me as a bit far-fetched, especially the part about drowning, I looked for Bauer's source for this assertion. But Bauer cites no source for it. I then checked, but found no confirmation of this assertion in any of the "standard" works on the Holocaust, not in Hilberg's *The Destruction of the European Jews*,

not in Reitlinger's *The Final Solution*, not in Dawidowicz's *The War Against the Jews*, not in Levin's *The Holocaust*, not in Poliakov's *Harvest of Hate*, not in Manvell and Frankel's *The Incomparable Crime*. What I did find is that a few of these books claim a massacre of either 19,000 Jews (both Hilberg and Levin—who cites Hilberg) or 26,000 Jews (Reitlinger) in Odessa in October of 1941 as a "reprisal" for the deaths of several dozen Romanian soldiers resulting from the explosion of a delayed-action landmine left behind in what had been NKVD headquarters. These "authorities on the Holocaust" agree that these Jews were shot. Hilberg, and Levin, citing Hilberg, also claim that another 40,000 Jews were subsequently taken out of Odessa and shot in anti-tank ditches, bringing the total of Odessa Jews allegedly killed by the Romanians to about 60,000. So where, pray tell, did Yehuda Bauer come up with 144,000 civilians murdered at Odessa, "largely by drowning?"

On page 209 Bauer makes the offhand remark that ". . . no gassings took place at Mauthausen. . . . " However, he gives no inkling of how he arrived at this revisionist conclusion regarding Mauthausen. But if Bauer is right, the implications are interesting. Consider: In his 1966 book, *The Trial of the Germans*, Eugene Davidson discussed, and dismissed, Ernst Kaltenbrunner's defense at Nuremberg (p323):

> Kaltenbrunner admitted to none of these charges despite all the witnesses and the overwhelming evidence against him. On the stand, under the searching questioning of British prosecutor Colonel Amen, he could only deny the authenticity of his own signature and declare that the witnesses were lying who said they had seen him in Mauthausen when killings were staged in his honor by gas, hanging, and shooting.

Davidson found it inconceivable that witnesses might have lied about Kaltenbrunner attending a gassing at Mauthausen. But Yehuda Bauer implies such witnesses *were* lying when he asserts that "no gassings took place at Mauthausen." In fact, Bauer's statement implies that *all* the testimonies about gassings at Mauthausen are false, including those of ex-inmate Johann Kanduth, ex-SS-guard Alois Hoellriegel and camp commandant Franz Ziereis. For the deposition of Hoellriegel, which implicated Kaltenbrunner, see *The Case Against Adolf Eichmann*, edited by Henry A. Zeiger, Signet, pages 141-143. This book also contains excerpts from the interrogation of Kanduth, also implicating Kaltenbrunner, on pages 143-145. Regarding "the deathbed confession" of Ziereis, see Appendix 2 of Germaine Tillion's *Ravensbrueck* (Anchor Books). And see page 8 of Simon Wiesenthal's memoirs, *The Murderers Among Us* (Bantam), for a passing ref-

erence to "the horrors of the gas chambers" of Mauthausen. Yehuda Bauer did not mention these testimonies, let alone explain why he rejects them as incredible. Perhaps he feared that had he done so some of his readers might have wondered why he accepts as credible the similar testimonies about gassings at Polish "extermination camps."

In any case, it certainly is possible to raise questions about the credibility of Bauer's star witnesses about gassing, Kurt Gerstein, Rudolf Hoess and Filip Mueller. On pages 210-211, Bauer quotes excerpts from the Gerstein "report" on a mass gassing of Jews at Belzec. Bauer, however, has omitted most of the blatant absurdities of the Gerstein "report," such as the claim that the Nazis gassed a total of 25 million people. And Bauer gives a calculatedly misleading account of the adventures of Jan Karski, another self-proclaimed Belzec eyewitness whose testimony raises questions about Gerstein's story of mass gassings of Jews at Belzec. According to Bauer (p300):

> To see for himself what was happening, Jan Karski (a pseudonym), a Polish patriot and a Catholic humanitarian, visited the Warsaw ghetto after the summer 1942 deportation. Disguised as a guard, he then managed to enter Belzec death camp for one day where he witnessed mass murder.

So Jan Karski (a pseudonym) witnessed "mass murder" at Belzec. Bauer does not elaborate on Karski's witnessing of "mass murder," allowing naive readers to incorrectly assume that Karski witnessed the operation of the infamous "gas chambers" of Belzec described by Gerstein. But, assuming Karski accurately recounted real experiences at Belzec, the only mass murder he saw was the killing of perhaps "a few score" Jews in the process of brutally herding more than 5,000 Jews *into* the cars of a train which then *left* the Belzec camp. (See Karski's 1944 book, *The Story of a Secret State*, Houghton Mifflin, Chapter 30.) Karski, who supposedly was at Belzec not quite two months after Kurt Gerstein supposedly witnessed a gassing at Belzec, did not even see any gas chambers, let alone witness a gassing.

It is true that Karski claimed that Jews were herded into railroad cars at Belzec as part of a process of mass extermination. According to Karski,

> The floors of the car had been covered with a thick, white powder. It was quicklime. Quicklime is simply unslaked lime or calcium oxide that has been dehydrated. Anyone who has seen cement being mixed knows what occurs when water is poured on lime. The mixture bubbles and steams as the powder combines with the water, generating a large amount of heat.
>
> . . . The moist flesh coming in contact with the lime is rapidly

> dehydrated and burned. The occupants of the cars would be literally burned to death before long, the flesh eaten from their bones. (pp349-350)

Karski, however, did not claim to have *seen* the occupants of the cars being "literally burned to death, . . . the flesh eaten from their bones." And Karski's assumptions about this are implicity challenged by Bergen Evans in his book, *The Natural History of Nonsense* (Vintage). According to Evans,

> That quicklime will "eat" a dead body is an old delusion that has brought several murderers to the noose, for, actually, it is a preservative that instead of removing the evidence keeps it fresh for the coroner's eye. . . . Oscar Wilde, who poetically asserted that quicklime ate the flesh by day and the bones by night, served to refute his own assertion, for he was himself buried in quicklime, and on his exhumation two years later was found to be well preserved. (pp132-133)

If, as Evans said, quicklime does not "eat" the flesh of a dead body, then would it have "eaten" the flesh from the bones of the living Jews shipped out of Belzec as Karski said it would?

In any case, it so happens that Karski was not alone in "proving" Nazi atrocities by exploiting the supposed power of quicklime to "eat" flesh. According to Bergen Evans,

> . . . when the resourceful Mr. W.A.S. Douglas, of the Paris Bureau of the *Chicago Sun*, was confronted with an empty internment camp, Fort de Romainville, deserted by the retreating Germans, he was quick to perceive that it was actually a "death factory" for "the martyred heroines of France." No heroines or fragments of heroines were found, but that only added to the horror of it all: they had obviously been "buried in quicklime." (p133)

Whatever the truth may be about the alleged mass extermination of Jews with quicklime, Yehuda Bauer was clearly delinquent in asserting—without explaining and justifying the assertion—that Jan Karski witnessed "mass murder" at Belzec. And he was also delinquent in not even attempting to reconcile Karski's testimony with that of Kurt Gerstein.

Another of Bauer's star witnesses to mass extermination of Jews by gassing is Rudolf Hoess. Hoess gave a number of confessions to his various postwar captors and interrogators. Bauer cites only one of these confessions, the autobiography written in prison in Communist Poland and published in an English translation as *Commandant of Auschwitz*. Robert Faurisson, however, has identified some significant anomalies in that confession. (See "The Gas Chambers of Auschwitz Appear to be Physically Incon-

ceivable" and "The Gas Chambers: Truth or Lie?," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1981.) And Arthur Butz has pointed out numerous anomalies in another Hoess confession, an affadavit of 5 April 1946. (See *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, Chapter IV.) Rather than repeat the criticisms of Faurisson and Butz, I will simply point out a few additional anomalies to be found in Hoess's various confessions.

In a portion of the autobiography quoted by Yehuda Bauer (p214), Hoess described an experimental gassing.

> Protected by a gas-mask I watched the killing myself. In the crowded cells death came instantaneously the moment the cyclon B was thrown in. A short, almost smothered cry, and it was all over. . . .

But is Zyklon B capable of killing "instantaneously?" To do so, Zyklon B crystals, when exposed to open air, would have to release lethal quantities of hydrogen cyanide gas instantaneously. Is that possible? I don't know for certain, but it seems unlikely. In any case, it seems pretty certain that hydrogen cyanide gas, once released, does *not* kill instantaneously. According to page 53 of *Treatment of War Injuries*, a booklet published in 1942 by Merck & Co., manufacturing chemists, "The poison inhibits oxidation in the body and may cause extremely rapid death by paralysis of the respiratory center." The booklet then describes the symptoms of hydrogen cyanide poisoning. "There may be rapid development of vertigo, headache, palpitation and dyspnea [i.e., labored breathing], followed by coma, convulsions and death." Thus, although inhalation of air containing sufficient hydrogen cyanide gas may cause "extremely rapid death," it apparently does not cause instantaneous death. (If it caused death instantaneously, how would there be time for the development of the various symptoms described above?)

In "The Gas Chambers: Truth or Lie?," Robert Faurisson has summarized the procedure of gassing condemned prisoners by hydrogen cyanide gas in American prisons. According to Faurisson, "Within approximately 40 seconds [after the release of the gas], the prisoner dozes off, and in a few minutes he dies." Although Bauer, on page 214, uncritically quotes Hoess's story about instantaneous death caused by Zyklon B, on the very next page he describes the standard gassing procedure at Auschwitz and says, "After a few minutes of intense suffering, the victims died." Thus Bauer agrees with Faurisson that gassing by hydrogen cyanide causes death after a few minutes. So why does Bauer approvingly quote Hoess's tale about a gassing in which the victims died instantaneously?

In any case, if Faurisson is right that the victim of a hydrogen

cyanide gassing "dozes off" after about 40 seconds, then Bauer is presumably wrong about the victim dying after a few minutes "of intense suffering." Although it doesn't say when, the Merck & Co. booklet does say that the victim of hydrogen cyanide goes into a coma before dying. This is at least a partial confirmation of Faurisson's assertion. At any rate, the information that the victim of hydrogen cyanide gas goes into a coma before dying renders quite dubious another statement from Hoess's 5 April 1946 affadavit, to wit, "We knew when the people were dead because their screaming stopped." Can someone in a coma scream?

In addition to Hoess's autobiography, *Commandant of Auschwitz* includes a statement on "the Final Solution" made by Hoess in Cracow, Poland in November of 1946. Yehuda Bauer does not quote these passages from that statement:

> When I went to Budapest in the summer of 1943 and called on Eichmann, he told me about the further actions which had been planned in connection with the Jews.
>
> At that period there were more than 200,000 Jews from the Carpatho-Ukraine, who were detained there and housed in some brickworks, while awaiting transport to Auschwitz.
>
> Eichmann expected to receive from Hungary, according to the estimate of the Hungarian police, who had carried out the arrests, about 3,000,000 Jews.
>
> The arrests and transportation should have been completed by 1943, but because of the Hungarian government's political difficulties, the date was always being postponed.
>
> In particular the Hungarian army, or rather the senior officers, were opposed to the extradition of these people and gave most of the male Jews a refuge in the labor companies of the front-line divisions, thus keeping them out of the clutches of the police. When in the autumn of 1944, an action was started in Budapest itself, the only male Jews left were the old and the sick.
>
> Altogether there were probably not more than half a million Jews transported out of Hungary.
>
> The next country on the list was Romania. According to the reports from his representative in Bucharest, Eichmann expected to get about 4,000,000 Jews from there.
>
> . . . In the meantime Bulgaria was to follow with an estimated two and a half million Jews. The authorities there were agreeable to the transport, but wanted to await the result of the negotiations with Romania.
>
> . . . The course taken by the war destroyed these plans and saved the lives of millions of Jews. (*Commandant of Auschwitz*, Popular Library, pp189-190.)

Indeed, if the estimates supposedly given to Hoess by Eichmann were accurate, then "the course taken by the war" saved the lives of about 9 million Jews in Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria! Since, according to Bauer (p334), there were only 9 million Jews

in all of Europe before the war, it's no wonder he doesn't mention this inconvenient testimony from one of his star witnesses. You don't become "one of the world's top authorities on the Holocaust" by dwelling on the absurdities of Rudolf Hoess's confessions.

On page 215, Yehuda Bauer quotes from Hoess's testimony regarding cremations at Birkenau: "The two large crematoria I and II . . . had five three-retort ovens and could cremate about 2,000 bodies in less than 24 hours." Hoess never explained how such numbers of cremations were possible, nor does Bauer explain this. However, another of Bauer's star witnesses is Filip Mueller, supposedly a member of the Auschwitz-Birkenau *Sonderkommando*, who has said of crematorium I at Birkenau, "Its fifteen huge ovens, working non-stop, could cremate more than 3,000 corpses daily." (*Eyewitness Auschwitz: Three Years in the Gas Chambers*, Stein and Day, p59.) How was it possible to cremate such numbers? According to Mueller, 3 bodies were cremated simultaneously in each oven and each cremation took only 20 minutes.

To judge from a recent *Los Angeles Times* article by Carol McGraw ("Cremation: Boom Brings Controversy," 13 April 1983), Mueller's claim about cremating 3 corpses simultaneously in each oven is within the realm of possibility. McGraw quotes the head of a cremation company:

> You can tell in 30 seconds if a crematory is legitimate, he said. They [i.e., consumers] should look at the product—ashes should be pure white. If several bodies are cremated together, they won't burn uniformly and the ashes come out very dark.

But to judge from the same article, Mueller's claim about cremating 3 corpses together in 20 minutes is not within the realm of possibility. As McGraw reported, "In the cremation process, a body is placed in a furnace and subjected to temperatures of up to 2,000 degrees for two or three hours." If it takes 2 or 3 hours to cremate a body in a present-day crematory, is it possible that the crematoria of Birkenau could have done so in 20 minutes? As Mueller himself says (p61), "These were, of course, not modern or technically advanced crematoria." If one assumes that cremations at Birkenau took 2 hours, then, even if 3 bodies were cremated simultaneously in each oven, crematorium I's 15 ovens, working non-stop, could have cremated no more than 540 bodies in 24 hours. That's a far cry from Hoess's "2,000 bodies in less than 24 hours" or Mueller's "3,000 corpses daily." And, of course, if cremations at Birkenau took longer than 2 hours, as seems quite possible if 3 bodies were being cremated simultaneously in each oven, then crematorium I at Birkenau could not

have cremated even as many as 540 bodies in 24 hours. Thus, it appears that Rudolf Hoess and Filip Mueller have grossly exaggerated the capacity of the Birkenau crematoria. However, Yehuda Bauer, "one of the world's top authorities on the Holocaust," swallows their gross exaggerations as eagerly as if they were lox and cream cheese.

According to Bauer (p215), "Between 1.5 and 3.5 million Jews died at Auschwitz." Bauer cites no source for these figures, nor does he provide any explanation of how they were arrived at or of how they could possibly be true. And, strangely, although he can't be any more precise than this about Auschwitz, nevertheless, on page 334 he states that, "During the Holocaust, 5.8 million Jewish people died. . . . " Thus, according to Bauer, 5.8 million Jews died in the Holocaust regardless of how many Jews died at Auschwitz. For Bauer, whether 1.5 million Jews died at Auschwitz or 3.5 million Jews died at Auschwitz, in either case 5.8 million Jews died during the Holocaust. Could it be that Yehuda Bauer wants to believe, no matter what, that 5.8 million Jews, i.e., about 6 million Jews, died during the Holocaust?

In a chapter on "The Last Years of the Holocaust, 1943-1945," Yehuda Bauer reports (p326), "When Majdanek was liberated in July 1944, the Russian reports on what they found there were viewed with disbelief in the West." Indeed Richard E. Lauterbach, one of the journalists who parroted those "Russian reports" in the Western press, complained about such disbelief in his 1945 book, *These Are the Russians* (Book Find Club, p326): "The story of Maidanek was printed in American newspapers and magazines. But millions of Americans have never heard of it, and many who have do not believe it." But *what* did the "Russian [i.e., Soviet] reports" on Maidanek say? Yehuda Bauer does not spell out for his readers the actual contents of those "reports," perhaps because he does not want his readers to realize that he himself does not completely believe them. The Soviet "reports" on Maidanek included the allegation that ". . . one and a half million people were in one way or another put to death in this camp, about half of them Jews." (See *Newsweek*, 11 September 1944, page 64.) But according to Bauer (p209), "[Majdanek] accommodated 50,000 inmates, and in the course of its history, 200,000 died there." Thus Yehuda Bauer implies that the Soviet "reports" exaggerated the number of deaths at Maidanek by 1,300,000! Thereby Bauer himself vindicates those who, as Lauterbach complained in 1945, were already saying "these reports are untrue or exaggerated."

Interestingly enough, Lauterbach also complained about disbelief of other Soviet atrocity "reports," including the "report" that, "At Tremblyanka [sic] in Poland, an estimated 2,764,000

Jews were annihilated." By comparison, Bauer claims (p209) that 840,000 Jews were killed at Treblinka. Of course, even Bauer's (unsupported) claim may be a gross exaggeration.

Before concluding this review, I want to mention a few miscellaneous items of interest in *A History of the Holocaust*. On page 18 Bauer says, "Jewish tribes for a time controlled the Yemen. . . . " It would be interesting to know more about this historical episode, but Bauer does not elaborate.

On page 61 Bauer makes the following assertion: "Against a background of economic crisis which hit everyone, not only the Jews, one-third of Polish Jewry in the thirties was on the verge of starvation or beyond it." Bauer returns to this theme on pages 143-144, quoting Sholem Asch, who wrote in October of 1936 that the Polish Jews seemed to be "buried alive. Every second person was undernourished, skeletons of skin and bones, crippled, candidates for the grave." But if, as Bauer says, one-third of Polish Jews, about a million Polish Jews, were already "on the verge of starvation or beyond it" *before* the war, then is it really surprising that many Jews (perhaps even hundreds of thousands) would have died of starvation and starvation-related diseases during nearly six years of war and military occupation? Is the explanation for such deaths Nazi diabolism or rather the deleterious effects of a prolonged war on the situation of about one million already-impoverished Polish Jews?

In this regard it is interesting to note the contents of chapter 4 of Reb Moshe Schonfeld's book *The Holocaust Victims Accuse* (Neturei Karta of U.S.A.). According to Schonfeld, the Committee to Boycott Germany of the World Jewish Congress in 1941 demanded, in the name of Zionist bigwig Stephen Wise, that Zeirei Agudas Israel stop sending food parcels to Polish Jewry, because this was a breach of Britain's boycott regulations against Germany. When the demand was rejected, another Zionist honcho, Joseph Tennenbaum, organized the picketing of Zeirei Agudas Israel's office. According to Schonfeld, Zeirei Agudas Israel did not yield to this pressure, but "a majority of naive New York Jews became confused and the sending of packages sharply declined." If Schonfeld's account is accurate, then it would appear that the Zionists were actually prepared to starve Polish Jewry as a means of starving Nazi Germany.

In a section on "Jewish-Gentile Relations in Eastern Europe," Bauer relates the following (pp284-285):

> The accusation of Jewish-Soviet cooperation in Eastern Polish areas occupied by the Soviets in 1939 was leveled by the Poles throughout the war. There was some truth to this. Soviet occupation was better than Nazi rule, and the Soviets abolished the restrictions that had prevented Jews in Poland from entering uni-

versities, the administration, and some trades. However, the fact that Jewish attitudes changed as the Soviets restricted religious life, abolished all Jewish institutions, and confiscated property, was ignored by Polish public opinion. According to Polish figures, 264,000 Jews were deported into Soviet exile or Soviet camps, or between 17 and 20 percent of the Jews in Soviet-occupied Eastern Poland. During the war itself, in the absence of any substantial help extended by Poles or Ukrainians, the Soviet army and the return of the Soviet regime were seen by the Jews as the only hope for rescue. Jewish forest and ghetto fighters sought aid from the Soviets. The Poles, who feared Soviet rule no less than they hated the Nazi conquerors, could not identify with the Jewish attitude.

Another item of interest is an appendix in which Bauer gives the text of Himmler's 28 May 1940 secret memorandum, "Reflections on the Treatment of Peoples of Alien Races in the East." Some revisionists have cited this memorandum's reference to "the Bolshevist method of physical extermination of a people" as "un-German and impossible." But it is useful to have the full text of the memorandum.

In an interview given to *Conspiracy Digest* and reprinted in his book *The Illuminati Papers* (And/Or Press), Robert Anton Wilson opined (p43), "Those who make a career out of spreading unproven accusations against other humans can only be forgiven if they really are so ignorant and stupid that they don't know the difference between an assertion and an evidential demonstration." Yehuda Bauer, Professor of Holocaust Studies and author of seven books, seems to be making just such a career out of spreading unproven accusations against other humans, specifically unproven accusations against Hitler and his henchmen. I doubt that Bauer is really so ignorant and stupid that he doesn't know the difference between an assertion and an evidential demonstration. But, on second thought, maybe he is that ignorant and stupid. After all, he *is* "one of the world's top authorities on the Holocaust."

Book Reviews

DAS HOSSBACH-'PROTOKOLL': DIE ZERSTOERUNG EINER LEGENDE (THE HOSSBACH 'PROTOCOL': THE DESTRUCTION OF A LEGEND) by Dankwart Kluge. Leoni am Starnberger See: Druffel Verlag [D-8131], 1980, 168pp, DM 19.80, ISBN 3-8061-1003-4.

Hitler, we're told over and over again, set out to conquer the world, or at least Europe. At the great postwar Nuremberg Tribunal the victorious Allies sought to prove that Hitler and his "henchmen" had engaged in a sinister "Conspiracy to Wage Aggresive War." The most important piece of evidence produced to sustain this charge was and is a document known as the "Hossbach Protocol" or "Hossbach Memorandum."

On 5 November 1937, Hitler called a few high officials together for a conference in the Reich Chancellery in Berlin: War Minister Werner von Blomberg, Army Commander Werner von Fritsch, Navy Commander Erich Raeder, Air Force Commander Hermann Goering, and Foreign Minister Konstantin von Neurath. Also present was Hitler's Army adjutant, Colonel Count Friedrich Hossbach.

Five days later, Hossbach wrote up an unauthorized record of the meeting based on memory. He did not take notes during the conference. Hossbach claimed after the war that he twice asked Hitler to read the memorandum, but the Chancellor replied that he had no time. Apparently none of the other participants even knew of the existence of the Colonel's conference record. Nor did they consider the meeting particularly important.

A few months after the conference, Hossbach was transfered to another position. His manuscript was filed away with many other papers and forgotten. In 1943 German general staff officer Colonel Count Kirchbach found the manuscript while going through the file and made a copy for himself. Kirchbach left the Hossbach original in the file and gave his copy to his brother-in-law, Victor von Martin, for safe keeping. Shortly after the end of the war, Martin turned over this copy to the Allied occupation authorities, who used it to produce a substantially altered version for use as incriminating evidence at Nuremberg. Sentences such as those quoting Hitler as saying that "The German question can only be solved by force" were invented and inserted. But over all, the document presented at Nuremberg is less than half the length of the original Hossbach manuscript. Both the original written by Hossbach and the Kirchbach/Martin copy have completely (and conveniently) disappeared.

According to the Hossbach document presented at Nuremberg and widely quoted ever since, Hitler told those present that his remarks were to be regarded as a "final testament" in case of his death. The most incriminating section quotes Hitler as saying that the armed forces would have to act by 1943-45 at the latest to secure the "living space" ("Lebensraum") Germany needed. However, if France became weakened by internal crisis before that time, Germany should take action against Czechia (Bohemia and Moravia). Or if France became so embroiled in war (probably with Italy) that she could not take action against Germany, then Germany should seize Czechia and Austria simultaneously. Hitler's alleged references to German "living space" refer only to Austria and Czechia.

When Hitler came to power in 1933, Germany was militarily at the mercy of hostile foreign states. Rearmament had begun slowly, and in early 1937, because of a raw materials shortage, the three armed service branches had to cut back. A furious dispute broke out between the branches for the remaining allocation.

Contrary to what the Hossbach protocol suggests, Hitler called the conference of 5 November 1937 partially to reconcile the squabbling heads of the military branches and partially to revive the German rearmament program. Foreign policy was only a subsidiary issue. Hitler sought to justify the need for rebuilding German armed strength by presenting several exaggerated and hypothetical foreign crisis cases which would require military action, none of which ever occurred. Hitler announced no new course in German foreign policy, much less a plan for aggressive war.

At Nuremberg Goering testified that Hitler told him privately just before the conference that the main purpose in calling the meeting was "to put pressure on General von Fritsch, since he (Hitler) was dissatisfied with the rearmament of the army." Raeder confirmed Goering's statement.

Like some other aristocratic and traditionalist conservatives, Hossbach became a bitter opponent of Hitler and the National Socialist regime. He was an intimate friend of General Ludwig Beck, who was executed in 1944 for his leading role in the conspiracy which tried to assassinate Hitler and overthrow the government. Despite his postwar denial, it is virtually certain that Hossbach prepared his slanted version of the conference at Beck's urging for possible use in discrediting the Hitler regime following a *coup d'etat*. Hossbach was also close to Admiral Wilhelm Canaris, head of military intelligence, and General Ziehlberg, both of whom were also executed for their roles in the 1944 assassination plot. Even in early 1938 Hossbach, Beck and Canaris were in favor of a *coup* to forcibly overthrow Hitler.

The Hossbach memorandum is frequently cited in popular historical works as conclusive proof of Hitler's plans for aggressive war. A good example is William Shirer's best-selling but unreliable *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, which alleged that the protocol recorded "the decisive turning point in the life of the Third Reich." At this critical conference, Shirer wrote, ". . . the die was cast. Hitler had communicated his irrevocable decision to go to war. To the handful of men who would have to direct it there could no longer by any doubt." Like many other Germanophobe publicists, Shirer deceptively cites the Hossbach memorandum as a reliable record. He even distorts the actual wartime importance of the conference participants. Of the five top officials present, three (Blomberg, Fritsch, Neurath) lost their high positions within months of the meeting. Raeder was replaced as Navy Commander in January 1943. Only Goering was really close to Hitler.

The important role of the fraudulent Hossbach protocol at the Nuremberg Tribunal is another damning confirmation of the illegetimate, show-trial character of this most extravagent judicial undertaking in history. On the basis of the protocol, which became Nuremberg document 386-PS, the Tribunal indictment declared: "An influential group of the Nazi conspirators met together with Hitler on 5 November 1937 to discuss the situation. Once again it was emphasized that Germany must have living space in Central Europe. They recognized that such a conquest would probably meet resistance that would have to be beaten down with force, and that their decision would probably lead to a general war." U.S. prosecutor Sidney Alderman told the Tribunal that the memorandum ("one of the most striking and revealing of all the captured documents") removed any remaining doubts about the guilt of the German leaders for their crimes against peace. It was also the basis for the conclusion of the Nuremberg judges that the German "Conspiracy to Wage Aggressive War" began at the conference of 5 November 1937. The document was crucial in condemning Goering, Neurath and Raeder for their roles in the "criminal conspiracy." The spurious Hossbach protocol is all too typical of the kind of evidence used by the victorious Allies at Nuremberg to legitimize their judicial imprisonment and murder of defeated Germany's leaders.

There is now no doubt that the Hossbach protocol is worthless as a historical document. After the war both Hossbach and Kirchbach declared that the U.S. prosecution version is quite different than the document manuscript they recalled. Hossbach also testified at Nuremberg that he could not confirm that the prosecution version corresponded completely with the manuscript he wrote in 1937. And in his memoirs, he admitted that in

any case, Hitler did not outline any kind of "war plan" at the meeting. At Nuremberg, Goering, Raeder, Blomberg and Neurath all denounced the Hossbach protocol as a gross misrepresentation of the conference. (Fritsch was dead.) The protocol deals only with the first half of the meeting, thereby distorting its true character. The memorandum concludes with the simple sentence: "The second half of the conference dealt with material armaments questions." No details are given. In 1968 Victor von Martin characterized the memorandum with these words: "The protocol presented at the Nuremberg court was put together in such a way as to totally change the meaning [of the original] and can therefore be characterized only as a crude forgery."

When he wrote his path-breaking study, *The Origins of the Second World War*, A.J.P. Taylor accepted the Hossbach memorandum as a faithful record of the meeting of 5 November 1937. However, in a supplementary "Second Thoughts" added to later editions, the renowned British historian admitted that he had initially been "taken in" by the "legend" of the document. The allegedly significant conference was actually "a maneuver in domestic affairs." The protocol itself, Taylor noted, "contains no directives for action beyond a wish for increased armaments." He ruefully observed that "those who believe in political trials may go on quoting the Hossbach memorandum." H.W. Koch, a Lecturer at the University of York (England), further dismantled the legend in a 1968 article which concluded that the infamous protocol would be "inadmissible in any other court except the Nuremberg tribunal."

Dankwart Kluge has made a valuable contribution to our understanding of the origins of the Second World War. His study will stand for many years as the most authoritative dissection of a great documentary fraud. This attractive work includes the complete text of the Hossbach protocol as an appendix, four photos, and a comprehensive bibliography. The author was born in 1944 in Breslau (Wroclaw), Silesia. Since 1974 he has worked as an attorney in West Berlin. Kluge has done an admirable job of assembling his material, which is drawn not only from all the available published and documentary sources, but also from numerous private interviews and correspondence with key witnesses. Kluge argues his case compellingly, although the narrative style is somewhat weak. This important study leaves no doubt that the highly touted protocol is actually a forged revision of an uncertified copy of an unauthorized original, which has disappeared. Harry Elmer Barnes, to whom the work is dedicated, would have welcomed it heartily.

—*Mark Weber*

PARIS IN THE THIRD REICH: A HISTORY OF THE GERMAN OCCUPATION, 1940-1944 by David Pryce-Jones. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1981, x + 294 pages, 116 photographs, $25.00, ISBN 0-03-045621-5.

The claim that thousands of Parisians were members of the anti-Nazi "Resistance"* is an aspect of the Second World War that has come under increasing scrutiny in recent years. As British historian David Pryce-Jones explains in his study of *Paris in the Third Reich*, there was little actual resistance activity in the French capital. Indeed, during the German occupation life in Paris went on much as it had before the war.

A striking point is the contrast between the behavior of the victorious German occupiers of France in 1940 and that of the Allied troops who overran Germany in 1945. Unlike what happened in Germany and Central Europe in 1945, when the Germans took Paris there were no scenes of mass pillage, rape, and murder. The French mass circulation weekly *L'Illustration* described the German soldiers as "handsome boys, decent, helpful, above all correct." Hitler even cancelled a huge victory parade that had been planned by the military, so as not to alienate the Parisians. Within a few days after the onset of the German occupation, the schools, restaurants, theaters, trains, newspapers, and other public services were back in operation on a near-normal basis. The Paris police, who outnumbered the Germans, remained on duty throughout the occupation.

Nor did the Germans round up large numbers of political opponents and suspects. Jean-Paul Sartre, Coco Chanel, Dior, Yves Montand, Maurice Chevalier, Picasso, and Albert Camus were among those who lived and worked—very productively—in Paris during the German occupation. One French writer, Louis-Ferdinand Celine, expressed surprise that the Germans were "not shooting, hanging, exterminating the Jews . . . stupified that anyone with a bayonet would not be using it all the time. 'If the Bolsheviks were in Paris, they'd show you how to set about it, they'd show you how to purge a population, district by district, house by house. If I had a bayonet, I'd know my business.' "

As noted above, Pryce-Jones sheds additional light on the so-called "Resistance." Many Frenchmen intensely disliked the Partisans, who did not go into action against the Germans until after

---

*Casting a wry eye at the superabundance of exaggerated post-war claims, made when it was safe to do so—indeed, rather unsafe not to—the historian James J. Martin has remarked on "the undoubted fraction of one percent of the residents of France who were not involved in the 'Resistance.' "

Hitler attacked the Soviet Union in June 1941. The Communist Partisans, large numbers of whom were not native-born Frenchmen, hoped to provoke German reprisals which would then alienate the French populace. In this they succeeded. But Germans were not their only targets: throughout the occupation, other Communists, assorted leftists, and rightists were murdered by the Partisans.

Once the Germans were forced to withdraw from France in the summer of 1944, a new "Reign of Terror" commenced. Pryce-Jones estimates that there were 105,000 summary executions in France between June 1944 and February 1945. "The number of Frenchmen killed by other Frenchmen, whether through summary execution or rigged tribunals akin to lynch mobs or court martials and High Court trials, equalled or even exceeded the number of those sent to their death by the Germans as hostages, deportees, and slave-laborers." (The fullest treatment in English of the bloodbath that accompanied "liberation" is found in Sisley Huddleston's 1955 book *France: The Tragic Years, 1939-1947.*)

Often, Frenchmen could not understand the logic involved in these reprisals. One women remarked at the time, after her daughter's head was shaved: "My little Josiane, it's too horrible. Her hair has been cut off, monsieur. Poor little Josiane! If she went to bed with Germans, it was because she's seventeen, monsieur, you follow me? But why ever cut off her hair for it? It's a crying shame, monsieur. She's just as willing to go to bed with Americans!"

Paris in the Third Reich includes excerpts from some of the interviews the author conducted with former collaborators, German veterans, and other observers. Over a hundred photographs, some in color, supplement the text. Those interested in this chapter of contemporary history will find the book useful.

—*Charles Lutton*

Swiss Historian Exposes Anti-Hitler Rauschning Memoir as Fraudulent

Virtually every major biography of Adolf Hitler or history of the Third Reich quotes from the memoir of Hermann Rauschning, a former National Socialist Senate President of Danzig. In the book published in Britain as *Hitler Speaks* (London, 1939) and in America as *The Voice of Destruction* (New York, 1940) Rauschning presents page after page of what are purported to be Hitler's most intimate views and plans for the future. They are allegedly based on a hundred or so private conversations between the two men.

Now, after more than forty years, a Swiss historian has thoroughly exposed this supposed document of Hitler's madness as completely fraudulent. Wolfgang Haenel presented the results of his research to the annual conference in May 1983 of the Ingolstadt Contemporary History Research Center in West Germany.

Rauschning's Hitler is nothing more than a nihilistic revolutionary utterly lacking in ideas, goals, principles or systematic ideology who demagogically exploited words and men to accumulate power for its own sake. He was a clever but completely unscrupulous opportunist who believed nothing of what he said. His National Socialism, according to Rauschning, was just a "Revolution of Nihilism." He was allegedly preoccupied with war. His numerous disarmament proposals and peace offers were just hypocritical rhetoric designed to mislead his future victims.

Of the man who unified Germany, Hitler is supposed to have said: "Bismarck was stupid. He was just a Protestant." He allegedly rebuked Rauschning for his qualms: "Why do you babble about brutality and get upset over suffering. The masses want that. They need some cruelty." "I want a violent, masterful, fearless, cruel youth," he is quoted as saying. On another occasion, Hitler reportedly declared: "Yes, we are barbarians. We want to be barbarians. It is an honorable title."

Wolfgang Haenel spent many years in detailed research, text comparison and interviewing contemporary witnesses. He found that instead of "about a hundred conversations" with Hitler, Rauschning actually met with the German leader only four or five times. And these few meetings were neither private nor lengthy, but always in the company of high ranking officials while visiting Hitler in Berlin or Obersalzberg. Rauschning never had the opportunity to hear Hitler's intimate views or secret plans for the future, as he boasted in his spurious "memoir."

Wolfgang Haenel's long overdue debunking of the Rauschning "memoir" is a welcome contribution to the slow and painful process of clarification in an age of historical obfuscation.

—*Mark Weber*

Sebastian Haffner's 1942 Call for Mass Murder

One of postwar Germany's most influential writers has been Sebastian Haffner. This successful wordsmith has written half a dozen books on political and historical issues, several of which have been translated into English. His most recent is a highly critical review of Adolf Hitler's life and place in history. The American edition, *The Meaning of Hitler*, received very favorable reviews in the American press. For many years Haffner contributed a regular column of political commentary to West Germany's leading general-circulation illustrated weekly, *Stern*.

Haffner's persuasiveness lies in his ability to present liberal-democratic, egalitarian ideas in apparently detached and objective prose. His sober and confident style reassures many otherwise skeptical readers.

But Haffner's real character came through in an extraordinary article published during the Second World War while he was living as an emigré in Britain. In the August 1942 issue of the reputable London monthly *World Review*, Haffner called for the mass murder of at least half a million young Germans by the victorious Allies at the end of the war. According to his article "The Reintegration of Germany into Europe," the National Socialist revolution of 1933 had divorced Germany from Christian European civilization. An Allied victory in the World War would make it possible to restore the prewar order.

Fortunately, Haffner wrote, the "hard core" of Nazi revolutionaries were concentrated in the SS and could therefore be easily liquidated. The SS had become "for all practical purposes the human integration of Nazism. It is Nazism incarnate. With its elimination Nazism may not yet be dead as an idea, but it will be dead as an active political force for the decisive next ten years. Thus the road will be clear for the reconstruction of a Europe embracing Germany. But it must be eliminated first."

Haffner did not shrink from spelling out just how that would be accomplished. "Now this is a stark and gruesome matter. In all probability it amounts to the killing of upwards of 500,000 young men, whether by summary court-martial (no such mass-justice

can be other than summary) or without even that ceremony. Even if one wants to avoid the actual killing and instead to convert the SS into a number of life-serving mobile forced-labor divisions for international use, it would mean not much more than a living death."

The mass killing, Haffner exclaimed, would be "a resounding act of international justice." After all, "it would be criminal sentimentality to leave the terrorists alive and abroad when dearly-bought victory at last makes it possible to dispose of them."

A comprehensive "re-education" program would also be necessary to make sure that defeated Germany stayed in line permanently. But since the vast majority of the German people obviously backed its National Socialist leadership, only a small group of anti-Nazi Protestant clergy and Roman Catholic priests could be entrusted with this important task. "Thank God Christianity is still a very vital supranational force in Europe, a nucleus not only of spiritual but even of structural unity." A network of Christian schools would be responsible for "re-educating German youth—eradicating Nazism as an idea—making Germany a Christian country again and reintegrating Germany into Europe."

Haffner's article is not the first call for genocide in the name of Christianity made in history.

Haffner's murderous proposal was only partially implemented. Many tens of thousands of young SS men, not only from Germany but from across Europe, were in fact murdered by the victorious Allies in both the East and West.

I learned about Haffner's article by accident while going through back issues of the leading German National Socialist newspaper, the *Voelkischer Beobachter*, on a microfilm machine at the Library of Congress. A lengthy front page report in the 11 December 1942 issue publicized the bloody Allied proposal for "pacifying" Europe. It was hard for me to believe that one of West Germany's most influential political writers could have once authored such a plan. But it didn't take long to locate the original article in a bound volume on an obscure, dusty shelf of the world's largest library.

A year before the appearance of Haffner's article, American Jewish attorney Theodore Kaufman proposed a similar final solution to the German problem. In *Germany Must Perish*, Kaufman called for the sterilization of all fertile adult Germans, and the total partitioning-off of Germany among neighboring countries. But unlike Kaufman, who fell into obscurity after the war, Haffner's star rose to great heights. He was able to play a major role in re-educating and remaking defeated Germany into the kind of tractable, "civilized" country he wanted.

In 1946, the victorious Allies executed newspaper publisher and former Nazi party district leader Julius Streicher at Nuremberg for "crimes against humanity." He had been found "guilty" of disseminating anti-Jewish writings, particularly in his monthly paper *Der Stuermer*. That is, Streicher was killed for actions which were illegal neither under German nor U.S. law at the time they were carried out. And at no time did Streicher ever call for the killing of Jews or anyone else on the basis of race, religion or membership in an organization.

Sebastian Haffner, in contrast, openly called for the killing of at least half a million young men simply on the basis of membership in an organization—an act which he conceded would be a "stark and gruesome matter." If Haffner were to be judged according to the standards applied by the Allies at Nuremberg, he would be punished for "crimes against humanity."

But Haffner has never been called to account for his genocidal call. To the contrary, he has been richly rewarded in postwar democratic Germany. How many of Sebastian Haffner's millions of readers would think differently of him and his views if they knew about his wartime call for mass murder?

—*Mark Weber*

Erich von dem Bach-Zelewski and the 'Holocaust'

During the Second World War, Erich von dem Bach-Zelewski was an SS Obergruppenfuehrer, Higher SS and Police Chief for the center section of the Eastern front, and Chief of the Anti-Partisan Units.

He testified for the prosecution at the postwar Nuremberg Tribunal as part of a deal struck with the Allied authorities. Probably the most devastating part of his testimony dealt with the activities of the Einsatzgruppen.

In 1951 he was sentenced to ten years' arrest by a Munich denazification court. In 1952 he publicly denounced himself as a mass murderer. In February 1961 he was sentenced by a Nuremberg court to four and a half years' imprisonment for a 1934 murder. At that 1961 trial he declared: "I am still an absolute Hitler man." (New York *Times*, 21 March 1972, p. 44.) In August 1962 he was sentenced to life imprisonment for the 1933 murders of some communists. (New York *Times*, 4 August 1962, p. 4.)

On 24 July 1964, Bach-Zelewski reportedly testified at the trial of SS Obergruppenfuehrer Karl Wolff that "Hitler knew nothing

of the mass destruction of the Jews" and that "the entire thing began with Himmler." (David Irving, *Hitler's War*, p. 946, note for pp. 428-429, Viking two-volume ed.)

Bach-Zelewski died in a suburban Munich hospital on 8 March 1972, but his death was not publicly announced until 20 March. Newspaper reports of his passing appeared in the editions of 21 March. *Die Welt*, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, and the *Sueddeutsche Zeitung* each carried the same, short Associated Press dispatch. The *Times* of London report was also very short. The New York *Times* published a much more complete obituary. (21 March 1972, pp. 44, col. 1.) The Washington *Post* and the Washington *Star* reported nothing.

In the book *The Myth of the Six Million*, the author (David L. Hoggan, as "Anonymous") states on page 80 that: "Bach-Zelewski in April, 1959, publicly repudiated his Nuremberg testimony before a West German court, and he admitted with great courage that his earlier statements, which had no foundation in fact, had been made for reasons of expediency and survival."

Despite extensive searching in numerous daily newspapers and periodicals, I have not been able to find any confirmation of Hoggan's statement that Bach-Zelewski repudiated his Nuremberg testimony. It would be very useful to find confirmation in a reputable publication of this alleged repudiation.

—*Mark Weber*

A Note from the Editor, continued from p. 260

should be made by a professional chemist. Dr. Lindsey's sympathy with his erstwhile colleague is manifest and unapologetic. The story he tells is of a man doing his job, perfecting his science in all innocence and being caught up in the massive wave of hatred and sheer lunacy that swept over Europe after World War II. Dr. Tesch paid with his life the price the victors demanded for the sanctification of their atrocity propaganda. Reading this account of his conviction before the bar of Allied "justice," one will perhaps understand why the revisionist may, in answer to that eternal question of the uninformed: "What about the *trials*?," smile while rolling up his sleeves, and say:

"The *trials*? I'm really glad you asked that question. You're absolutely right about their importance. Let's do take a *good look* at those trials . . ."

—Keith Stimely

About the Contributors

WILLIAM B. LINDSEY received his B.Sc. degree from the University of Texas and his Ph.D. in Chemistry from Indiana University. He has been a professional research chemist with a major corporation for 31 years. As a chemist he has for some years been interested in the question of the alleged role of the chemical fumigant Zyklon B in the "Holocaust" story.

H. KEITH THOMPSON is a New York City corporate executive. He received his B.A. degree in History and Naval Science from Yale University in 1946. As a former naval officer and expert in naval law, he has maintained an active interest in the post-World War II "war crimes" trials particularly as they related to military personnel.

JAMES B. WHISKER holds a Ph.D. in government and politics from the University of Maryland. He is currently an Associate Professor of Political Science at West Virginia University. He is the author of *Essays in Political Science* (with H.N. Kim), *The Social, Political, and Religious Thought of Alfred Rosenberg*, and *National Socialist Ideology: Concepts and Ideas*.

L.A. ROLLINS, 35, received a B.A. degree in Philosophy from California State College at Los Angeles in 1970. He is a freelance writer who has written material for a stand-up comic and has contributed to various publications, including *The Personalist*, *Books for Libertarians*, *Reason*, *New Libertarian*, *Critique* and *Grump*. He is the author of *The Myth of Natural Rights*, forthcoming from Loompanics Unlimited. For several years he has been researching the "Holocaust" and related matters.

MARK WEBER is a frequent contributor to *The JHR*. He received his M.A. in modern European History from Indiana University in 1977. He now works in Washington D.C. as a writer, researcher and translator.

CHARLES LUTTON, Ph.D., holds degrees in History and International Relations. He teaches courses on the political and military history of the 20th Century, is associated with a leading think-tank, and is widely published in both scholarly and popular journals.